

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. 71.—No. 10.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 5TH, 1831.

[Price 1s. 2d.]

TO

MONSIEUR GUIZOT,

*A Member of the Chamber of Deputies of France.**Kensington, 24th February, 1831.*

MONSIEUR,

IN a speech, which is reported to have been made by you, in the Chamber of Deputies, on the 19th of this month, I find the following propositions: "That the Government of France ought to reside in the Chamber of Deputies; that the Chamber ought never again to hope to be popular; that it never can be, if it do its duty; that, ever since the Revolution in England of 1688, there has never existed a popular House of Commons; that yet England has preserved her liberties; that, therefore, France ought in this respect, to imitate England."

If the people of England were Roman Catholics, they would, upon reading this, have *crossed themselves*, as pious Catholics do when they see, or think they see, some ghost, or the approach of some signal infliction of Providence. Being Protestants, and not in the habit of resorting to this pious mode of expressing our alarm, we stare with astonishment; we are astounded at reading these words; our feeling is a mixture of apprehension for the liberties of the people of France, and of inexpressible indignation against the speaker.

If we had nothing to guide us but the experience of all the nations in the world, we should at once pronounce agreeably to the expression of Mr. John Adams, one of the founders of the American Republic, and since, one of its Presidents, that "of all the scourges that God, in his wrath, ever permitted to be employed to punish the sins of wicked nations, the greatest scourge is that of a Government, all the powers of which reside in a legislative assembly; because men will commit acts of tyranny, so assem-

A

MONSIEUR GUIZOT,

*Membre de la Chambre des Députés de France.**Kensington, 24 Février, 1831.*

MONSIEUR,

DANS un discours que vous avez fait, à ce qu'on rapporte, dans la chambre des députés, le 19 de ce mois, je trouve les propositions suivantes; "que le gouvernement de France doit résider dans la chambre des députés; que la chambre ne doit plus espérer d'être dorénavant populaire; qu'elle ne peut jamais l'être, si elle fait son devoir; qu'en Angleterre, depuis la révolution de 1688, la Maison des Communes n'a jamais été populaire; que cependant l'Angleterre a conservé ses libertés; que, par conséquent, la France doit, sous ce rapport, imiter l'Angleterre."

Si les Anglais étaient Catholiques Romains, en lisant ceci, ils auraient fait le *signe de la croix* comme font les Catholiques pieux lorsqu'ils voient ou croient voir une apparition à l'approche d'un châtiment signalé de la providence. Etant Protestants, et nullement accoutumés à recourir à ce mode pieux d'exprimer nos alarmes, nous sommes saisis d'étonnement, nous restons stupéfaits en lisant ces mots; ce que nous éprouvons est un mélange de crainte pour les libertés du peuple de France, et d'une indignation inexprimable contre l'orateur.

N'aurions-nous pas l'expérience de toutes les nations de la terre pour nous servir de guide, nous n'hésiterions pas à prononcer à l'instant, conformément aux expressions de M. John Adams, un des fondateurs de la liberté Américaine, et depuis un de ses présidents, que "de tous les fléaux que Dieu dans sa colère ait jamais permis qu'on ait employés pour punir les péchés des nations coupables, le plus grand fléau est celui d'un gouvernement dont tout le pouvoir réside dans une assemblée législative, parceque les hommes ainsi assemblés

"bled, that they never would dream of committing singly, and one by one." "The despot," adds Mr. Adams, "is known: the band of despots shelter one another from the knowledge and resentment of the people."

It is much about the same thing, if there be two assemblies, and if they be essentially one body in point of interest. However, leaving theory, or general principles, out of the question, let us come to the *practice*. You have illustrated your doctrine by citing the English House of Commons, as constituting the best Government in the world; as having the Government absolutely in its hands; as having preserved the liberties of the country; as being worthy of the imitation of France; and as having been first established; and having first begun its career, at the Revolution of 1688. Now, I agree that it did begin its career at the Revolution of 1688; I agree that it has, in fact, had the Government essentially in it from that time to this; but I deny that it has preserved the liberties of England; and I deny that it ought to be an object of imitation with France.

The liberties of England consisted most particularly in the certainty of *Trial by Jury*, and in the administration of the law by *Judges entirely independent of the Crown and of its Ministers*. Since the year 1688, laws have been passed to take away the trial by Jury, both in criminal and pecuniary cases, in, I believe, nine instances out of ten. Men may now be imprisoned for long periods even, and they may have their property taken from them by fines, without any trial by Jury; nay, in certain cases, they may be *transported for seven years without trial by Jury*. With regard to the *independence of the Judges*, a thing so long and so justly the boast of England, there are, in every county of the kingdom, men called *justices of the peace*, in number without limit. These justices are, very frequently, and, I believe, *most* frequently, Bishops, Deans, Prebends, Canons, Rectors, or Vicars, of the Established Church, officers of the Army and the Navy, place-

commettront des actes de tyrannie qu'ils n'auraient jamais pensé à commettre chacun en son particulier." "Le despote," ajoute M. Adams, "est connu; les despotes en corps se dérobent les uns les autres à la connaissance et au ressentiment du peuple."

C'est à peu près la même chose s'il y a deux assemblées, et si leurs intérêts respectifs les réunissent essentiellement en un seul corps. Cependant laissant la théorie, ou les principes généraux, hors de question, venons à la *pratique*.

Vous expliquez votre doctrine en citant la Maison des Communes d'Angleterre, comme constituant le meilleur gouvernement de la terre; comme ayant absolument tout le pouvoir dans ses mains; comme ayant conservé les libertés du pays; comme étant digne de l'imitation de la France; et comme ayant d'abord été établie, et ayant d'abord commencé sa carrière à la révolution de 1688. Je conviens qu'en effet, depuis lors jusqu'aujourd'hui elle a eu essentiellement le gouvernement en sa possession; mais je nie qu'elle ait conservé les libertés de l'Angleterre; et je nie qu'elle doive être un objet d'imitation pour la France.

Les libertés de l'Angleterre consistent surtout dans le *jugement par jury* et dans l'administration du pays par des juges entièrement indépendants de la couronne et de ses ministres. Depuis l'an 1688, des lois ont été faites pour ôter au jury la connaissance des délits soit civils soit criminels, dans, je crois, neuf cas sur dix. Aujourd'hui on peut être emprisonné même pour long-temps, et on peut être dépouillé de sa propriété par des amendes, sans jugement par jury; qui plus est, en certains cas, l'on peut être transporté pour sept ans, sans jugement par jury.

Venons maintenant à l'*indépendance des juges*, chose qui a été long-temps, et à juste titre, l'orgueil de l'Angleterre. Il y a dans chaque comté du royaume, des hommes appelés *juges de paix*, dont le nombre est illimité. Ces juges sont ordinairement, et, je crois, très souvent, des évêques, des doyens, des prébendiers, des chanoines, des recteurs ou vicaires

poss

men, pensioners, and sinecurists. At any rate, whatever the proportion of these may be, there are many such who are justices of the peace in every county of the kingdom. Now, Sir, these justices are not only appointed at the sole pleasure of the Ministers, but may be turned out of office at the pleasure of the Ministers, without cause assigned; and yet these men have the power, without any appeal from their decision, to inflict heavy fines, and to sentence men not only to imprisonment at their sole discretion, but also to sentence them to transportation at their discretion. And this is by no means a nominal power; for some of them have recently passed a sentence of imprisonment for five years, and have transported men for life! The members of the House of Commons are, for the greater part, themselves Justices of the Peace! So that they are not only the makers but also the executors of the law; thus setting at defiance that great principle of our constitution, that the legislative and judiciary functions ought to be kept distinct. I will trouble you with no more instances in which the liberties of England have been preserved by this famous House of Commons, so strict an imitation of which you are desirous to introduce in order to preserve the liberties of France! But, Sir, the sensible way of judging of the value of a thing, is, by looking at the effects which that thing has produced. This House of Commons, which is the object of your admiration and eulogium, found England without a Debt, without a standing army, and without barracks; it has furnished it with a Debt of eight hundred millions of pounds sterling, with a standing army (in time of profound peace) of about 100,000 men, and it has covered the country over with dépôts and barracks, which two latter are expressly contrary, the very existence of them is contrary, to the law and constitution of England, as these are laid down by BLACKSTONE, who wrote only seventy years ago. This famous House of Commons found England in safe, secure, tranquil possession of the rising colonies now

l'armée et de la marine, des employés, des pensionnaires, et des sinécristes. Dans tous les cas, en quelque proportion que ce soit, il y a un grand nombre de ces différents individus qui sont juges de paix dans tous les comtés du royaume. Or, Monsieur, ces juges de paix sont non seulement nommés d'après le seul plaisir des ministres, mais ils peuvent être destitués selon le plaisir des ministres, sans qu'aucun motif soit assigné; et cependant ces hommes ont le pouvoir, sans qu'on en appelle de leurs décisions, d'imposer de fortes amendes, et de condamner non seulement à l'emprisonnement selon leur seule sagesse, mais aussi de condamner à la déportation selon leur sagesse, et ceci n'est nullement un pouvoir nominal, car il y en a plusieurs qui dernièrement ont passé sentence d'emprisonnement pour cinq ans, et ont déporté des individus pour la vie! Il y a un grand nombre de membres de la Maison des Communes qui sont eux-mêmes juges de paix! De sorte que non seulement ils sont les faiseurs mais aussi les exécuteurs des lois; se jouant ainsi de ce grand principe de notre constitution, que les fonctions législatives et les judiciaires doivent être séparées.

Je ne vous citerai pas d'autres exemples de la manière dont les libertés de l'Angleterre ont été conservées par cette fameuse Maison des Communes d'après la quelle vous désirez modeler votre chambre, afin de conserver les libertés de la France! Mais, Monsieur, le meilleur moyen de juger de la valeur d'une chose, est d'examiner les effets que cette chose a produits. Cette Maison des Communes qui est l'objet de votre admiration et de vos éloges a trouvé l'Angleterre sans dette, sans armée permanente, et sans casernes; elle lui a procuré une dette de huit cent millions de livres sterling, avec une armée permanente (en temps d'une paix profonde) d'environ 100,000 hommes, et elle a couvert le pays de dépôts et de casernes, quoique ces deux derniers objets soient expressément contraires, que leur existence même soit contraire à la loi et à la constitution d'Angleterre; ainsi qu'on le voit dans Blackstone qui

called the United States of America; colonies existing in willing obedience, in attachment unparalleled, to England; and it passed laws, following one another in augmented oppression and insult, till those colonies were not only severed from England for ever, but until they were urged to become an independent nation, which is now become the most formidable rival of England herself.

This famous House of Commons, the like of which you are so anxious to obtain as a Government for the people of France, found England with taxes raised by the state to the amount of one *million two hundred thousand pounds a year*; and it has brought it to an amount of taxes raised for the state of upwards of *sixty millions of pounds sterling a year*! Will you say that, nevertheless, the people of England are as well off as they were before? Here is my answer: in England we have a general tax on house and land for the relief and maintenance of poor persons who are unable, by themselves or their relations, to provide for their own wants. In 1687, these poor-taxes amounted, for all England and Wales, in one year, to *one hundred and sixty thousand pounds*; they now amount in one year, to *seven millions, five hundred thousand pounds*! Thus, you see, that the increasing misery of the people has kept a pretty exact pace with the increase of the taxes raised by the State; while from the documents, laid before the parliament, you will learn, that *crimes*, the offspring of misery, have increased in a still greater proportion; and as those taxes have all been imposed by the House of Commons, to that House, the precise like of which you are so anxious to introduce into France, this disgraceful increase of misery and crime is solely to be ascribed.

But is it peace; is it tranquillity; is it content amongst the people of France, that you wish to produce by placing

vivait il y a seulement soixante et dix ans. Cette fameuse Maison des Communes a trouvé l'Angleterre jouissant tranquillement et dans la plus grande sécurité de ses nouvelles colonies, appelées aujourd'hui les Etats-Unis d'Amérique; colonies qui, outre une obéissance volontaire, montraient à l'Angleterre un attachement sans exemple; et elle a passé successivement des lois d'oppression et d'insulte jusqu'à ce que ces colonies se sont non seulement séparées de l'Angleterre pour jamais, mais jusqu'à ce qu'elles ont été forcées de devenir une nation indépendante, qui est même devenue la rivale la plus redoutable de l'Angleterre elle-même.

Cette fameuse Maison des Communes, sur le modèle de laquelle vous désirez tant d'obtenir un gouvernement pour le peuple Français, a trouvé l'Angleterre avec des taxes levées pour l'Etat, se montant à un *million deux cent mille livres par an*; et cette somme augmentée des taxes levées pour l'état, elle l'a poussée jusqu'à plus de soixante millions de livres sterling par an! Direz-vous que cependant les Anglais sont aussi heureux qu'ils l'étaient auparavant? Voici ma réponse: en Angleterre, nous avons une taxe générale sur les maisons et sur les terres pour le soulagement et le maintien des personnes qui ne peuvent, par elles-mêmes ou par le secours de leurs parents, pourvoir à leurs propres besoins. En 1687, ces taxes pour les pauvres, se montaient par an, pour toute l'Angleterre, y compris la principauté de Galles, à *cent soixante mille livres*; elles se montent de nos jours à *sept millions cinq cent mille livres par an*! Ainsi, vous voyez que l'accroissement de la misère du peuple a marché de pair avec l'augmentation des taxes levées par l'Etat; tandis que vous verrez d'après les documents soumis au parlement que les *crimes* fruit de la misère se sont accrus dans une proportion plus grande encore; et comme ces taxes ont toutes été imposées par la Maison des Communes, c'est à cette Maison seule dont vous désirez introduire la semblable en France, que nous devons attribuer cette horrible et douloureuse augmentation de misère. Mais

that beautiful country and her brave people under a government like that of the House of Commons? Look, then, I pray you, Sir, at the situation of England and Ireland *now*? Read, if you can have patience to read; read, if indignation do not smother your voice; read the things called *Debates* which are at this moment going on in that very House of Commons itself. There you will learn that the Ministers know not what to do, nor which way to turn themselves; there you will see, that in their fiscal affairs, all is embarrassment and confusion; in their foreign affairs, all timidity and uncertainty and dread, and that with a hundred thousand men at their command, and a Fleet more expensive than that with which England fought, in the war of 1779, France, Spain and Holland, single-handed; there you will see them, with all this military and naval force in their hands, not daring even to whisper a "*no*" to the proposition for uniting Belgium with France. In their domestic affairs, there you hear them talking of raising fresh troops in England to be sent to keep down Irish insurgents: there you hear scheme after scheme propounded, to prevent the working people from starving; there you hear an Irish member declaring, that, in one district of Ireland, there are 200,000 persons upon the point of starvation; and there you hear Lord Howick, the bright son of our lofty and superb prime Minister, broaching a plan for MORTGAGING THE POOR-TAXES of England in order to raise money to send the working people *out of the Country*!

Frenchmen! This is the sort of Government which Mr. Guizot proposes that you shall be compelled to submit to! Such are the effects of the Government which is the object of his adoration. Understand clearly, I pray you, this scheme for sending Englishmen away from their country. All the houses and all the land are, as I observed

est-ce la paix; est-ce la tranquillité; est-ce le contentement que vous désirez procurer au peuple de France, en plaçant ce beau pays et ses braves habitants sous un gouvernement semblable à celui de la Maison des Communes? Examinez, Monsieur, je vous prie, la situation actuelle de l'Angleterre et de l'Irlande? Lisez, si vous avez la patience de lire, lisez, si l'indignation ne vous étouffe pas la voix; lisez ce qu'on appelle les *débats* qui dans ce moment-ci ont lieu dans cette Maison mêmes des Communes. Vous y verrez que les ministres ne savent que faire ni de quel côté se tourner; vous y verrez que dans leurs affaires fiscales tout est embarras et confusion; et que dans leurs relations extérieures il n'y a que timidité, incertitude et crainte, et qu'avec une armée de cent mille hommes à leurs ordres, et une flotte plus dispendieuse que celle avec laquelle l'Angleterre fit seule la guerre en 1779 contre la France, l'Espagne et la Hollande; vous y verrez qu'avec toutes leurs forces militaires et maritimes à leur disposition, ils n'osent pas souffler un "*non*" à la proposition qui se fait d'unir la Belgique à la France. Vous y apprendrez que dans leur administration intérieure ils parlent de lever de nouvelles troupes pour les envoyer contenir les Irlandais en insurrection; vous y verrez projet sur projet pour empêcher la classe ouvrière de mourir de faim; vous y entendrez un membre Irlandais déclarer que dans un district de l'Irlande il y a 200,000 personnes sur le point de mourir de faim; et vous'y entendrez Lord Howick, le fils glorieux de notre superbe premier ministre, proposer un plan pour HYPOTHEQUER LES TAXES DES PAUVRES de l'Angleterre, afin d'obtenir de l'argent pour envoyer la classe ouvrière hors du pays!

Français! telle est la sorte de gouvernement à laquelle M. Guizot propose qu'on vous force de vous soumettre. Tels sont les effets du gouvernement qui est l'objet de son adoration. Comprenez bien, je vous prie, ce projet d'envoyer les Anglais hors de leur pays. Toutes les maisons ainsi que toutes les terres, ainsi que je vous l'ai déjà dit, sont

before, subjected, and justly subjected, to an annual tax for the relief of the poor. Under this Government of a House of Commons, so much adored by Mr. Guizot, hundreds of thousands of idlers have been created to live upon the taxes. These have made the poor increase to such an extent, that the owners of the houses and the land are afraid that they will finally take away so much of their property as to leave them poor also; but this House of Commons, so much admired by Mr. Guizot, instead of diminishing the state taxes and the number of the idlers, are entertaining a project for sending the *working people* away out of the country for ever; and, to raise the money to do that, they are proposing to *mortgage the poor taxes-themselves*!

Such, Frenchmen, are the effects of that species of Government which Mr. Guizot wishes to introduce into France, and to force upon you. I need not tell you to reject his advice; for I perceive with pleasure that you heard it with indignation. He presses this scheme upon you, too, at the very moment when the people of this kingdom, from one end to the other, are crying aloud for a total change in the constitution of this House of Commons, ascribing to that house and to that house alone, all the fatal changes of which I have above spoken, and all the disgraces which our country now suffers; all the trouble, all the calamities, all the uncertainty, all the agitation which now shakes it to its very centre.

No, Frenchmen, you are not so foolish; you are not so credulous; you are not so grossly ignorant; and, above all things, you are not so superlatively base as to listen to this advice of Mr. Guizot. The whole world is filled with admiration of your valour; every honest heart, from pole to pole, beats with yours in anxious wishes for the establishment of your liberties and your happiness; and every man of sense is convinced that those liberties and that happiness never can exist for one single hour until the people of France be fully and

soumises, et soumises avec justice, à une taxe annuelle pour le soulagement des pauvres. Sous ce gouvernement d'une Maison des Communes tant vénérée par M. Guizot, des milliers de fainéants ont été créés pour vivre des taxes. Ceux-ci ont fait multiplier les pauvres jusqu'à un tel point, que les propriétaires des maisons et des terres sont effrayés qu'on ne finisse par leur enlever leur propriété et les réduire eux-mêmes dans la pauvreté; mais cette Maison des Communes si admirée de M. Guizot, au lieu de diminuer les taxes de l'état et le nombre des paresseux, complot le projet d'envoyer pour jamais la classe ouvrière hors du pays; et afin d'avoir de l'argent pour le mettre à exécution, elle propose d'hypothéquer les taxes mêmes des pauvres!

Tels sont, Français, les effets de cette espèce de gouvernement que M. Guizot désire introduire en France et vous imposer. Je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire de rejeter son avis; car je vois avec plaisir que vous ne l'avez entendu qu'avec indignation. Il s'efforce de de vous imposer son projet au moment même, qui plus est, où les peuples de ce royaume demandent, à grands cris, d'un bout à l'autre, un changement total dans la constitution de cette Maison des Communes, attribuant à cette Maison, et à cette Maison seule, tous les changements funestes dont je vous ai déjà parlé, et tous les malheurs qui maintenant accablent notre pays; toutes les inquiétudes, toutes les calamités toutes les incertitudes, toute l'agitation qui maintenant le remuent jusque dans ses fondements.

Non, Français, vous n'êtes pas assez insensés; vous n'êtes pas assez crédules; vous n'êtes pas d'une ignorance assez grossière; et surtout vous n'êtes pas d'une bassesse assez consommée, pour écouter les conseils d'un M. Guizot. Toute la terre est pleine d'admiration pour votre valeur; tous les cœurs honnêtes, d'un pôle à l'autre, partagent vos vives inquiétudes pour l'établissement de vos libertés et de votre bonheur; et tous les hommes éclairés sont convaincus que ces libertés et ce bonheur ne peuvent jamais exister un

fairly represented by those who are to make the laws affecting their properties and their lives. You have laid down the great principle; you have shed your blood for the great principle of the *sovereignty of the people*; but, the sovereignty of the people is a mockery unless the people choose who are to exercise that sovereignty; and that sovereignty consists wholly and solely in the making of the laws.

Frenchmen! from those to whom much is given, much is required; not for yourselves only, but for the whole of the oppressed part of mankind you are now about to act. With your example to cite, every oppressed man on earth has an answer to his despot. God has given you the fairest spot in the world to inhabit; he has blessed it with all his choicest blessings; he has given you as much valour as the hearts of human beings can contain; and oppressed millions in all parts of the world are now raising their hands to you, to set that example that shall rescue them from bondage.

WM. COBBETT.

heure entière, si le peuple de France n'est pas pleinement et loyalement représenté par ceux qui doivent faire les lois d'où dépendent leurs propriétés et leurs vies. Vous avez jeté les fondements du grand principe; vous avez versé votre sang pour le grand principe de la souveraineté du peuple; mais la souveraineté du peuple est une moquerie, si le peuple ne choisit pas ceux qui doivent exercer cette souveraineté; et cette souveraineté consiste entièrement et seulement dans le pouvoir de faire les lois.

Français! On demande beaucoup à ceux à qui beaucoup a été donné. Ce n'est pas pour vous seuls que vous devez agir, mais pour cette partie du genre humain qui est opprimée. Avec votre exemple à citer, tout individu opprimé sur la terre aura une réponse pour son despot. Dieu vous a donné pour habitation la plus belle partie du monde; il l'a comblée de ses dons les plus doux; il vous a donné autant de valeur que le cœur humain peut en contenir; et des millions d'opprimés dans toutes les parties de la terre lèvent maintenant leurs mains vers vous, pour que vous leur donniez cet exemple qui doit les délivrer de l'esclavage.

GME. COBBETT.

REFORM.

THE opening of the subject, in the "*Honourable*" House, on the 1st of March, 1831. I have here inserted the first two or three speeches, to which I shall add a few remarks of my own.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL: I rise, Sir, with feelings of the deepest anxiety to bring forward a question which, unparalleled as it is in importance, is as unparalleled in difficulties. It is my anxiety in approaching this question lessened by reflecting, that on former occasions I have brought this subject before the consideration of the House. For if, on other occasions, I have invited the attention of the House of Commons to this most important subject, it has been upon my own responsibility, unaided by any one—involving no one in the consequences of defeat; and I have sometimes been gratified with a partial success. (Hear, hear.) But this measure, which I am now about to bring forward, is not mine; but that of the Government, in whose name I appear to-night. (Cheers.) It is the deliber-

ate measure of the whole cabinet, unanimous upon this subject; and it has only been reserved to me to place this measure before the House as their measure, and in redemption of the solemn pledge which they have given to their sovereign, to Parliament, and to the country. (Hear, hear.) It is, therefore, with the greatest anxiety, that I venture to explain their intentions to this House on a subject, the interest of which is shown by the crowded audience who have assembled here; but still more by the deep interest which is felt by millions out of this House, who look with anxiety, with hope, and with expectation, to the result of this day's debate. (Cheers.) I am sure it will not be necessary for me to say more to do away with the notion which the honourable and learned Member opposite has endeavoured to excite, that this question, not being brought forward by a member of the cabinet, is not the measure of the King's Ministers. (Hear, hear.) I assure the House, that what I am about to propose is the measure that they have determined on; but though I cannot say that it is one of my originating, neither can I pretend that I have been kept in ignorance of its nature. The measure itself, after the noble Lord who is at the head of the Government had framed it in his mind, and

communicated it to his colleagues in the cabinet, was explained to me, and I have been ever since consulting individually or collectively with the members of that cabinet on the subject. I only wish that the noble Lord to whom I have alluded could have been permitted, by any law of Parliament, to have explained this measure in his own clear and intelligible language; but as that is impossible, I trust that the House will favour me with its indulgence while I perform the task of laying before the House the details of the measure—inadequately, I fear, but with a most sincere and earnest prayer for its efficiency and success. (Cheers.) Much cavil has been made upon an expression used by the noble Lord to whom I have before alluded—that he would endeavour to frame such a measure as would satisfy the public mind without endangering the settled institutions of the country. Some persons have said, that one part of the settled institutions of the country was composed of the close and rotten boroughs, but all must be convinced, I think, that the close and rotten boroughs were not what was intended by his Lordship. (Hear, hear, hear.) “But can you,” said this party, “pretend to satisfy the public mind without shaking the settled institutions of the country?” We are of an opinion the reverse of what is expressed in this question. We think that, attempting to satisfy the public mind will not endanger the institutions of the country, but that not to attempt to satisfy it would most certainly endanger them. (Cheers.) We are of opinion that these institutions rest, as they have always hitherto done, upon the confidence and the love of Englishmen—that they must continue to rest on the same foundation; and while we desire not to comply with extravagant demands, at the same time we are anxious to bring forward such a measure as every reasonable man may be satisfied should pass into a law. We wish to place ourselves between the two hostile parties—not agreeing with those who assert that no reform is necessary—not following in the path with others, who declare that some particular reform will alone be satisfactory to the people, or wholesome in its effect upon the state of the representation in this House; but placing ourselves between both, and between the abuses we wish to amend and the convulsion we hope to avert. (Cheers.) It will not be necessary, on this occasion, that I should go over the grounds which have frequently before been stated as arguments in favour of a change in the state of the representation; but it is due to the House that I should state shortly the points on which reformers rest their case. In the first place, then, the ancient constitution of our country declares that no man shall be taxed for the support of the state who has not consented, by himself or his representative, to the imposition of these taxes. The well-known statute, *De Tallagio non concedendo*, repeated the same language, and, although

some historical doubts had been thrown upon it, its legal meaning had never been disputed. It included “all the freemen of the land,” and provided that each county should send to the Commons of the Realm two Knights, each city two Burgesses, and each borough two Members. Thus about a hundred places sent representatives, and some thirty or forty others occasionally enjoyed the privilege, but it was discontinued or revived as they rose or fell in the scale of wealth and importance. Thus, no doubt, at that early period the House of Commons did represent the people of England: there is no doubt, likewise, that the House of Commons, as it now subsists, without entering into the history of the alterations it has from time to time undergone, does not represent the people of England. (Hear, hear, answered by a few loud cries of No, no.) Therefore, if we look to the question of right, the Reformers have right in their favour. Then, if we consider what is reasonable, we shall find a similar result. It will be impossible to keep the Constitution of the House as it exists at present. (Hear.) We have heard—as who has not—of the fame of this country—that in wealth it is unparalleled—in civilization unrivalled—and in freedom unequalled in the history of the empires of the world; and suppose a foreigner, well acquainted with these facts, were told that in this most wealthy, most civilized, and most free country, the representatives of the people, the guardians of her liberties, were chosen only every six years, would he not be very curious and very anxious to hear in what way that operation was performed by which this great and wise nation selected the members who were to represent them, and upon whom depended their fortunes and their rights? Would not such a foreigner be much astonished if he were taken to a green mound and informed that it sent two Members to the British Parliament?—if he were shown a stone wall, and told that that also sent two Members to the British Parliament—or, if he were walked into a park, without the vestige of a dwelling, and told that that, too, sent two Members to the British Parliament? Still more would he be astonished if he were carried into the north of England, where he would see large flourishing towns, full of trade and activity, vast magazines of wealth and manufactures, and were told these places send no representatives to Parliament? But his wonder would not end here: he would be astonished if he were carried to such a place as Liverpool (there can be no sufficient reason for not naming it by way of illustration), and there told that he might see a specimen of a popular election, and at the same time witness the most barefaced scenes of the grossest bribery and corruption. Would he not be indeed surprised, when he had seen all I have described, that representatives so chosen could possibly perform the functions of a Legislature? I say, then, that if we appeal to reason, the reformers have reason on their side. It

may be said by the opponents of a change, "We agree that in point of right, the House of Commons does not represent the people, and that in point of reason, nothing can be more absurd than the constitution of such a body; but Government is a matter of practice and worldly wisdom—of experience of life; and as long as the House of Commons enjoys the respect of the people, it would be unwise to change the system." In this argument I must confess there is much weight; and so long as the people did not answer the appeals of the friends of Reform (among whom I was always one), I felt that the argument was not to be resisted. But what is the case at this moment? The whole people call loudly for Reform. (Hear, hear, No, no, and much confusion.) That confidence, whatever it was, which formerly existed in the constitution of this House, exists no longer—it is completely at an end. (Loud cheers, with cries of "No, no," from the opposition benches, answered by redoubled cheers from the ministerial side.) Whatever may be thought of particular acts of the House of Commons, I repeat that the confidence of the country in the constitution and constitution of the House of Commons is gone (hear, hear, and No), and gone forever. (Much cheering, and continued disturbance.) I will say more—I will say that it would be easier to transfer the flourishing manufactures of Leeds and Manchester to Gatton and Old Sarum, than to re-establish the confidence and sympathy between this House and those whom it calls its constituents. (Hear, hear, hear.) I end this argument, therefore, by saying, that if the question be one of right, right is in favour of Reform; if it be a question of reason, reason is in favour of Reform; if it be a question of policy and expediency, policy and expediency are in favour of reform. (Loud and lasting cheers.) I come now to that difficult part of the subject—the explanation of the measure, which, representing the Ministers of the King, I am about to propose to the House. Those Ministers have thought, and, in my opinion, justly thought, that it would not be sufficient to propose a member which should merely lop off some excrescences, or cure some notorious defects; but would still leave the battle to be fought hereafter. (Hear, hear.) They have thought that no half measures would be sufficient, (hear, hear), that no trifling, no paltering with Reform (hear, hear), could give stability to the Crown, strength to the Parliament—or satisfaction to the country. (Much cheering.) Let us look, then, at what have been the chief complaints of the people; and in my mind there is much difference between complaints of grievances and propositions of remedy. We ought to look with deference to the opinions of the people on a matter of grievance; but, with regard to remedies, I should endeavour to discover, in communication with my friends, the relief that ought to be afforded. The chief grievances of which the people

complain are these. First, the Nomination of Members by individuals; second, the Elections by close Corporations; third, the Expense of Elections. With regard to the first, the nomination by individuals, it may be exercised in one or two ways; either over a place containing scarcely any inhabitants, and with a very extensive right of election, or over a place of wide extent and numerous population, but where the franchise is confined to very few residents. Gatton is an example of the first, and Bath of the second. At Gatton the right was popular, but there was nobody to exercise it: at Bath the inhabitants were numerous, but very few of them had any concern in the result of an election. We have addressed ourselves to both these evils, because we have thought it essential to apply a remedy to both; but they must, of course, be dealt with in different ways. With regard to boroughs, where there are scarcely any inhabitants, and where the elective franchise is such as to enable many individuals to give their voices in the choice of Members for this House, it would be evidently a mere farce to take away the right from the person exercising it, and to give it to the borough; and the only reform that can be justly recommended is to deprive the borough of its franchise altogether. (Hear, hear.) I am perfectly aware, that in making this proposition we are proposing a bold and decisive measure. (Loud cheers.) I am perfectly aware, and I should myself vote upon that persuasion, that on all ordinary occasions rights of this kind ought to be respected. (Hear, hear.) For no trifling interest, for no small consideration, ought they to be touched or injured; but I perfectly remember an occasion on which the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Peel) proposed a great and important measure with this effect. Two years ago, the right hon. Gentleman, standing here as a Minister of the Crown, proposed the measure of Catholic Emancipation. It was accompanied by another measure for the disfranchisement of 200,000 unoffending freeholders, who had broken no law, corrupted no right, but exercised their privilege, ignorantly, perhaps, but independently, and according to the best light they could obtain from their consciences. Now, if I am about to quote his words, it is not because I think he is bound to be consistent. (Hear, and some laughter.) On great questions of this kind, men must act as the interests of the country demand; but I beg the House to recollect that he stood here as the servant of the Crown, representing the Ministry which has gone out of office, and declaring in their name what principles ought to bind Parliament in the decision of a great question at an important crisis. I remember he told us that on fit occasions the House was bound to step beyond its ordinary rules, and that it did so on the discussion of the Union, of the Septennial Act, and some others. To avoid great dangers by extraordinary remedies, the House has not unfrequently dis-

regarded the common rules that govern its proceedings. The right hon. Gentleman then brought forward his measure, and he at once met the objection to which I have referred, in a few words. "I admit (said the right hon. Gentleman) at once the full force of the objection, which will be urged against that part of the measure I propose;" and he went on to allow, that the franchise of the Irish freeholder was "a vested right—a public trust," but which it was "competent to Parliament, under the especial circumstances of the case, to touch." Such were the sentiments of the right hon. Gentleman—sentiments, he it observed, in which the House agreed; and never was any measure carried through the House with more general approbation. Shall we say, then, that this principle is to be maintained when the poor peasantry of Ireland are concerned; but that when it touches the great and the wealthy, we are not to venture to treat the question as the public interest demands? Shall we at once deprive the freeholder of Ireland of that right which he merely exercised as the Constitution gave it to him, and shall we be afraid to touch the right of the noble Proprietor of Gatton, who returns two Members to Parliament, although he derived no such power from the Constitution? (Hear.) Shall we say that a strictly constitutional, a strictly legal right shall be abolished, because the convenience, the necessity of the country demands it—and that a right which is mere usurpation, with no sanction of law, and supported only by usage, shall be respected and left untouched, though the public interest requires, and the public voice demands its abolition? (Hear, hear.) Shall we make this glaring distinction between rich and poor, high and low, disfranchise the peasant, and prop the falling fortunes of the Peer? (Hear, hear.) The plan we propose is, therefore, meeting the difficulty in point—as the Duke of Wellington and his Colleagues met it in the year 1829; and our measure will have the effect of disfranchising a number of Boroughs. It would be a task of extreme difficulty to ascertain the exact proportion of the wealth, trade, extent, and population of a given number of places, and we have, therefore, been governed by what is manifestly a public record—I mean the Population Returns of 1821, and we propose that every Borough which in that year had less than 2000 inhabitants, should altogether lose the right of sending Members to Parliament. (Continued cheers, with much confusion.) The effect will be utterly to disfranchise sixty Boroughs. (Much cheering from all sides.) But we do not stop here. (Cheers and some laughter.) As the hon. Member for Boroughbridge (Sir C. Wetherell) would say, we go *plus ultra*. We find that there are forty-seven Boroughs, of only 4000 inhabitants, and these we shall deprive of the right of sending more than one Member to Parliament. (Vehement cheers.) We likewise intend that Weymouth, which at present sends four Members, shall, in future,

only elect two. The abolition of sixty Boroughs will occasion 119 vacancies, to which are to be added forty-seven for the Boroughs allowed to send only one Member, and two of which Weymouth will be deprived, making in the whole 168 vacancies. That, I believe, is the whole extent to which Ministers propose to go. (Cheers, and some laughter.) But, as I have already said, we do not mean to allow that the remaining Boroughs should be in the hands of select Corporations—that is to say, of a small number of persons to the exclusion of the great body of the inhabitants, who have property and interest in the place. It was a point of great difficulty to decide to whom the franchise should be extended. Although it is a much disputed question, yet I believe it will be found, that in ancient times every inhabitant householder resident in a Borough was competent to vote for Members of Parliament. As, however, this arrangement excluded villains and strangers, the franchise always belonged to a particular body in every town—that the voters were persons of property is obvious from the fact, that they were called upon to pay subsidies and taxes. Two different courses seem to prevail in different places. In some, every person having a house, and being free, was admitted to a general participation in the privileges formerly possessed by burgesses: in others, the burgesses became a select body, and were converted into a kind of corporation, more or less distinct—more or less exclusive of the rest of the inhabitants. These differences, the House will be aware, have led to those complicated questions of right which we are every week called upon to decide. I think no one will deny that our election committees often have before them the most vexatious, the most difficult and, at the same time, the most useless questions that men can be called upon to decide. Originally these points were decided in this House by the prevalence of one party or of another: they are now determined more fairly, but still the determinations are all founded upon the iniquity of the parties. (Hear, hear.) I contend that it is important to get rid of these complicated rights—of these vexatious questions, and to give to the real property and to the real respectability of the different cities and towns the right of voting for members of Parliament. The first distinction that naturally occurred as forming a proper class of voters was that pointed out by the bill of the right hon. Baronet opposite, (Sir R. Peel,) of persons qualified to serve on juries. But upon looking into this qualification, we found that in Edinburgh, Liverpool, Manchester, and other important places, although it certainly would give an extended constituency, it would still be too limited for the number of the inhabitants. On the other hand, in small boroughs, it would have the evil of confining the elective franchise to a very few persons indeed. According to the returns from the Tax Office, which, I admit, are not entirely to be depended upon, 10, 7, and 3, and even

1, would be the number of persons in some towns rated for a house of 20*l.* a year. Therefore we saw, if we took this qualification, we should be creating new close boroughs, and confining the elective franchise, instead of enlarging it; we, therefore, propose that the right of voting should be given to householders paying rates for houses of the yearly value of 10*l.* and upwards. Whether he be the proprietor, or whether he only rents the house, the person rated will have the franchise upon certain conditions, hereafter to be named. At the same time, it is not intended to deprive the present electors of their privilege to vote, provided they be resident. (Hear, hear, hear.) With regard to non-residence, we are of opinion that it produces much expense, that it is the cause of a great deal of bribery, and that it occasions such manifold and manifest evils, that electors who do not live in a place ought not to be permitted to retain their votes. (Hear, hear.) At the same time, I do not believe, that we are inflicting even upon this class any injury, for nearly all, either in one place or in another, will possess a franchise in the great mass of householders. (Hear.) With regard to resident voters, we propose that they should retain their right during life, but that no vote should be allowed hereafter, excepting on the condition I have before stated, that the person claiming the right must be a householder to the extent of 10*l.* a year. I shall now proceed to the manner in which we propose to extend the franchise in counties. The Bill I wish to introduce will give all copyholders to the value of 10*l.* a year, qualified under the right hon. gentleman's Bill to serve on juries, a right to vote for the return of knights of the shire (hear); also that leaseholders, for not less than twenty-one years, whose leases have not been renewed within two years, shall enjoy the same privilege. (Hear, hear.) [Sir R. Peel asked, across the table, the amount of rent which was necessary?] The right will depend upon a lease for twenty-one years, where the annual rent was 50*l.* (Hear.) It will be recollected that when speaking of the numbers disfranchised, I said that 168 vacancies would be created. We are of opinion that it would not be wise or expedient to fill up the whole number of those vacancies. After mature deliberation we have arrived at the conclusion, that the number of members at present in the House is inconveniently large. (Cheers and laughter.) I believe there is no hon. Gentleman who was a Member of the House before the Union with Ireland, who will not agree that the facility of getting through business has since been greatly diminished. Besides, it is to be considered when this Parliament is reformed, as I trust it will be before long, (hear, hear,) there will not be such a number of Members, who enter Parliament merely for the sake of the name, and as a matter of style and fashion. (Hear, and murmurs.) It is not to be disputed that some members spend their money in foreign countries, and never

attend the House at all, to a certain degree, to the inconvenience of those who do attend to their public duties. A few, I know for two or three years together, have never attended in their places; and, at the end of a Parliament, I believe there is generally found an instance or two of individuals, who, having been elected, have never appeared at the Table, even to take the oaths. But, it is obvious, that whenever a Member has a certain number of constituents watching his actions, and looking to his votes, in order that the people's money is not given for purposes inconsistent with the people's interests, his attendance will be much more regular. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, when we are proposing a great change, by cutting off a number of Members, the effect will be to facilitate public business, to the manifest advantage of the country. We propose to fill up a certain number of the vacancies, but not the whole of them. We intend that seven large towns should send two Members each, and that twenty other towns should send one Member each. The seven towns which are to send two Members each, are the following:—

Manchester and Salford	Wolverhampton, Bilston, and Sedgley
Birmingham & Aston	Sheffield
Leeds	Sunderland, and the Wearmouths
Greenwich, Deptford, and Woolwich	

The following were the names of the towns, each of which, it was proposed, should send one Member to Parliament:—

Brighton	Kendal
Blackburne	Bolton
Wolverhampton	Stockport
Macclesfield	Dudley
South Shields & Westoe	Tynemouth & North Shields
Warrington	Cheltenham
Huddersfield	Bradford
Halifax	Frome
Gateshead	Wakefield
Whitehaven, Workington, Harrington	Kidderminster

It is well known that a great portion of the metropolis and its neighbourhood, amounting in population to 800,000 or 900,000, is scarcely at all represented, and we propose to give eight Members to those who are thus unrepresented by dividing them into the following districts:—

Districts.	Population.
Tower Hamlets	283,000
Holborn	218,000
Finsbury	162,000
Lambeth	128,000

The two large populous parishes of Mary-le-Bonne, which, no doubt, were entitled to be represented, at least as much entitled to it as Boroughbridge, (hear, and laughter,) were included in one of the districts he had named. Next we propose an addition to the members for the larger counties—a species of

reform always recommended, and which, I believe, Lord Chatham was almost the first to advocate. Those counties contain a variety of interests, and form an admirable constituency; in some, as in Staffordshire, there is a large manufacturing population better represented in this way than perhaps in any other; and as County Members have unquestionably the most excellent class of constituents, they form of themselves a most valuable class of Representatives. The Bill I shall beg leave to introduce will give two additional Members to each of twenty-seven counties, where the inhabitants exceed 150,000. Everybody will expect that Yorkshire, divided into three Ridings—the East, West, and North—should have two Members for each riding; and the other counties to which this additional privilege will be given are the following:—

• Chester	• Devon
• Derby	• Essex
• Durham	• Kent
• Gloucester	• Lincoln
• Lancaster	• Salop
• Norfolk	• Stafford
• Somerset	• Sussex
• Suffolk	• Nottingham
• Yorkshire	• Surrey
• Wilts	• Northumberland
• Warwick	• Leicester
• Cumberland	• Southampton
• Northampton	• Worcester.
• Cornwall	

I will now proceed to another part of the subject. I spoke at first of the evils connected in the minds of the people with the power of nomination by individuals, and with the power of election by a few persons in very small and close corporations. The remedies I have detailed are pointed against these defects. I now beg leave to direct the attention of the House to that part of the plan which relates to the expense of long protracted polls, and which, while it removes that evil, also greatly facilitates the collection of the sense of the elective body. The names of electors are to be enrolled, and the disputes regarding qualification in a great measure avoided; we propose that all electors in counties, cities, towns, or boroughs, shall be registered, and for this purpose, machinery will be put in motion very similar to that in the Jury Act—that is to say, at a certain period of the year (I now speak of boroughs), the parish officers and churchwardens are to make a list of the persons who occupy houses of the yearly value of 10*l*. This list of names will be placed on the church doors, we will suppose in September and in the following month, October, the Returning Officer will hold a sort of trial of votes where claims made, and objections stated, will be considered and decided. When this process has been gone through, the returning officer will declare the list complete, and on the 1st of December in every year, the list will be published, every person who chooses, may obtain a copy of it, and it will be the rule to go-

vern electors and elections for the ensuing year. We intend, that during that ensuing year, every person shall be entitled to vote whose name is in the list, and that no question shall be asked, but as to his identity, and whether he has polled before at the same election. These regulations are extremely simple, and will prevent all those contemplated vexations and noisy scenes now so often witnessed, regarding disputed votes. The means of ascertaining who are the electors being thus easy, there is no reason why the poll should be kept open for eight days, or in some places for a longer period; and it is proposed that, nearly according to the present law, booths shall be erected in the different parishes, so that the whole poll may be taken in two days. For my own part, I may say that the time may come when the machinery will be found so simple that every vote may be given in a single day; but in introducing a new measure it is necessary to allow for possible defects in the working of the machinery: attempts might be made to obstruct the polling, and I therefore recommend two days, in order that no voter may be deprived of the opportunity of offering his suffrage. As to counties, the matter may be somewhat more difficult: we propose in the same manner that the churchwardens should make out a list of all persons claiming the right to vote in the several parishes, and that these lists shall be affixed to the church doors: a person to be appointed (say a harrister of a certain standing) by the Judge of Assize, shall go on an annual circuit within a certain time after the lists have been published, and he will hear all claims to vote, and objections to voters. Having decided who are entitled to exercise the privilege, he shall sign his name at the bottom of the list, and shall transmit it to the Clerk of the Peace. The list will then be enrolled as the names of the freeholders of the county for the ensuing year. With respect to the manner of proceeding at elections, we have it in view to introduce a measure which can hardly fail to be an improvement of the present system. Every body knows, and must have lamented the enormous expense to which candidates are put in bringing voters to the poll. In Yorkshire, without a contest, it costs nearly 150,000*l*.; and in Devonshire the electors are obliged to travel forty miles over hard cross-roads, which occupies one day; the next is consumed in polling, and the third in returning home; the whole a manifest source of vast expense, and most inconvenient delay. We propose, therefore, that the poll shall be taken in separate districts, those districts to be arranged according to circumstances by the Magistrates at Quarter Sessions. The counties will be divided into districts, which shall not be changed for two years. The formation of those districts will give an opportunity of more readily taking the votes when an election occurs. The Sheriffs shall hold the election on a certain day, and if it should happen that a poll be demanded, they shall adjourn

the election to the day next but one. The poll shall then be kept open for two days, so as to enable all the persons qualified under the several Acts of Parliament to give their votes. On the third day the poll shall be closed, and on the sixth day an account shall be published of the number of votes. It will be so arranged, that no voter shall have to travel more than fifteen miles to give his vote. (Hear, hear.) At the same time it is not proposed that the number of polling places in one county shall exceed fifteen, as the multiplication of places for receiving the votes would give rise to great inconvenience, and perhaps leave an opening for abuses. (Hear, hear.) We propose that each county shall be divided into two districts, returning each two Members to Parliament. In adjusting that division of the counties, there will, I have no doubt, be some difficulty. But I propose that his Majesty shall nominate a Committee of the Privy Council, to determine the direction and extent of the districts into which each county shall be divided. (Hear, hear.) Those Privy Councillors (hear, hear), those Privy Councillors, I say, shall be persons known to the House and to the country. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) They will be persons of known responsibility in the discharge of that duty. (Hear, and laughter.) In some of the boroughs, to which the right of representation will be continued, the number of electors is exceedingly small. We shall, therefore, insert in the bill, which we propose to submit to Parliament, a clause, giving power to the Commissioners, nominated under that bill, authority to enable the inhabitants of the adjoining parishes, and chapeltries, to take part in the elections, when the number of electors in such borough shall be below 300. (Hear, hear, hear, and great laughter.) That these are extensive powers I shall not attempt to deny. But, as the difficulty exists, it is our duty to consider how it may be overcome. How is it to be met, his Majesty's Ministers do not know, otherwise than by committing the power to persons known and responsible to Parliament, and to the nation, and appointed by the Royal Proclamation. If any hon. Gentleman stand up in his place and say that the powers which we propose to give to the Committee of the Privy Council are too great, I will only ask him, if it be granted that the business is to be done, that the objects for which we propose the Committee are proper and useful, can he suggest any better and more effectual mode of doing it? (Hear, hear.) If any Gentleman in the House will suggest a mode more safe, more constitutional, his Majesty's Ministers will have no difficulty in adopting that mode and waiving their own (hear, hear), their only object being to advance the interest of the people, to which every other consideration ought to yield. (Hear, hear.) I have now only one thing more to say with regard to the Representation of England. In all those new towns to which we propose to give the right of sending Members to Parliament,

all persons who are in them entitled by their property to vote, shall be excluded from the right to vote for the representatives of the county. At the same time that the towns shall have themselves a proper share in the representation, I do not intend that they shall interfere with the representation of the counties. (Hear.) It is not intended to interfere with the franchise of those freeholders who are at present entitled to vote. (Cries of hear, hear, and order.) I believe I have now concluded the statement of all the alterations which are intended to be made in the representation of England. With respect to the right of the forty-shilling freeholders in the counties, I do not think that there should be any alteration (hear); for I consider that they are a class of persons eminently qualified to have the trust of electors committed to them. By the smallness of the property which constitutes their qualification, they are especially calculated to give the representation that extended basis which it is most desirable that it should have. (A Member, whose name we do not know, here called on Lord John Russell to name the disfranchised boroughs;—repeated cries of "Order, order.") It is proposed to take away the right of electing Members to serve in Parliament from all towns which do not contain two thousand inhabitants. With respect to some of these, it was at first a question whether we should not still allow them to send each one Member; but, on consideration, we thought it better to avoid all chance of an imputation of partiality. We, therefore, determined to fix upon the number of two thousand inhabitants, and thereby leave no doubt that in their disfranchisement we were not influenced by partiality, by prejudice, or by a wish to favour some. (Hear, hear; order, order.) The noble Lord then read the following list, in the course of which he was frequently interrupted by shouts of laughter, cries of "Hear, hear," from present Members for the boroughs disfranchised, and various interlocations across the table. The "hear" of the honourable Member for Boroughbridge especially was followed by tremendous cheering and laughter.

Aldborough, York	Eye
Aldborough, Suffolk	Powey
Appleby	Gatton
Bedwin	Haslemere
Beeralston	Heyden
Bishop's Castle	Heytesbury
Bletchingley	Higham Ferrers
Boroughbridge	Hindon
(laughter)	Ilchester
Bossiney	East Looe
Brackley	West Looe
Bramber	Lostwithiel
Buckingham	Ludgershall
Callington	Malmesbury
Camelford	Midhurst
Castle Rising	Milborne Port
Corfe Castle	Minehead
Dunwich	Newport, Cornwall

Newton, Lancashire	Old Sarum
Newton, Isle of Wight	Seaford
Okehampton	Steyning
Orford	Stockbridge
Petersfield	Tregony
Plympton	Wareham
Queenborough	Wendover
Reigate	Weobly
Romney	Whitechurch
St. Mawe's	Winchelsea
St. Michael's Corn-	Woodstock
wall	Wootton Bassett
Saltash	Yarmouth

The following was the list of the boroughs which would be allowed to return one Member of Parliament each :—

Amersham	Lymington
Arundel	Maldon
Ashburton	Marlborough
Bewdley	Marlow
Bodmin	Morpeth
Bridport	Northallerton
Chippenham	Penryn
Clitheroe	Richmond
Cockermouth	Rye
Dorchester	St. Germans
Downton	St. Ives
Droitwich	Sandwich
Evesham	Sudbury
Grimsby	Shaftesbury
East Grinstead	Tainworth
Guilford	Thetford
Helston	Thirsk
Honiton	Totness
Huntingdon	Truro
Hythe	Wallingford
Launceston	Westbury
Leominster	Wilton
Liskeard	Wycombe
Lyme Regis	

(The noble Lord proceeded.) I now come to the representation of Scotland; and, certainly, if England wants reform, Scotland needs it still more. If we have here Members of Parliament representing but a small portion of the people, we still have some degree of popular representation. But, in Scotland, no such thing as popular representation is known. (Hear, hear.) A nation possessing the wealth, the industry, and intelligence for which Scotland is distinguished, has its whole representation vested in less than three thousand persons. In the counties, the number of persons who vote in the election of Members to serve in Parliament are only 2324. I shall not enter into a detail of the manner in which the Scotch votes are obtained. It is sufficient to observe, that although what is called the superiority could not originally arise otherwise than from the possession of land, yet many possessors of land contrived, in selling that property, to retain the superiority, which gives at present the right of representation. In that way it has become a custom to reserve the superiority when the land is sold. Latterly the voters at elections for the Scotch

counties have been, for the most part, persons having no connexion whatever with the county, otherwise than by the purchase of the superiority separately from the land. I have now in my hand a list, showing, that of the three hundred and fifty persons to whom the representation of the county of Ayr is confined, only one hundred and fifty have any property in that county. In Bute, out of seventeen electors, only two are landed proprietors in the island. In Kinross, of twenty-seven voters, eighteen only are possessors; and in Lanark, only two hundred and fifteen. (Hear.) I do not think that it is too much to say, that this is not a fair representation of the landed property in Scotland. If any gentleman will tell me, that by the arrangements which I propose the landowners of Scotland are deprived of their rights, I can refer him to this list, from which he will perceive that the landowners of Scotland have really at present no right. But I intend to give the suffrage to every copyholder whose possession is of the annual value of ten pounds (hear), placing that class on the same footing on which they are to be placed in England; and also to the holders of leases for nineteen years, not renewed within two years previous to the election at which they vote, and paying 50*l.* a year rent; for it is the custom in Scotland to give leases for nineteen years more generally than for twenty-one, as in England. We propose to make a new arrangement of the representation of the whole country; giving to Edinburgh two Members; to Glasgow, two; to Leith, Aberdeen, and Paisley, only one each. The Fife district of boroughs being disfranchised, that county, like the others, shall return one member; and, as we propose to do in England, the towns to which the right is extended shall be taken out of the representation of the counties. The electors in those towns will consist of all persons possessing property, or occupying houses of the value of ten pounds a year. Scotland possesses some advantages in respect to registration. With those alterations, therefore, Scotland will be represented in this House by fifty members, instead of the present forty-five. (Hear, hear, hear.) In those districts the votes at elections shall no longer be taken as at present. The election will no longer be made by the delegates of particular incorporations (hear, hear); but the votes of all the qualified electors shall be taken personally, and the election decided by the sum of those votes. The noble Lord then read a statement, of which we subjoin the substance.

The counties to be settled as follows:—Peebles and Selkirk to be joined, and to elect one member together; Dumbarton and Bute, Elgin and Nairne, Ross and Cromarty, Orkney and Shetland, Clerkmannau and Kinross, with certain additions, to do the same. The remaining twenty-two counties each singly to return one member.

Burghs to be as follow:—Edinburgh to have two members; Glasgow to have two; and

Aberdeen, Paisley, Dundee, Greenock, and Leith (with the addition of Portobello, Musselburgh, and Fisherrow), each singly to return one member.

The East Fife district of burghs no longer to return, but to be thrown into the county.

The remaining thirteen districts of burghs, each to return one member, with these variations—that Kilmarnock shall take the place of Glasgow in the district of burghs to which Glasgow formerly belonged; that Peterhead shall take the place of Aberdeen; and that Falkirk shall be added to the districts of Lanark, Linlithgow, Selkirk, and Peebles.

As to qualification of voters:—Burgh members no longer to be elected by town councils or delegates; nor county members by persons holding superiorities of certain value. The qualification for counties being ownership of land or houses, worth 10*l.* a year, with residence; or holding as tenant, in actual possession, on written lease for 19 years or upwards, to the value of 50*l.*

For burghs, the occupancy of a dwelling-house, rented or rated to taxes, at not less than 10*l.* a year.

All voters to be registered by Sheriffs.

Poll to be taken by Sheriffs or substitutes, at one or more places, not to be open for more than two days.

Reports from several polling places to be made to principal Sheriff, by whom the return is to be always made, for burgh as well as for county members.

The noble Lord then continued:—I shall now proceed to Ireland, in which country, although reform is necessary, it may still be much more simple than it can be in England or in Scotland, as the representation of the counties and boroughs was settled at the time of the Union. But in some of those boroughs the number of persons qualified by their property to vote is exceedingly small. I propose, therefore, to give the right of voting to all holders of houses or land to the value of 10*l.* a year. I am convinced that this will be found a measure of great benefit to Ireland. In many of those Irish boroughs the greatest inconvenience and difficulty have been suffered in consequence of the manner in which the franchise is regulated. I need only mention one instance—that of the borough of Wexford, in which many merchants of property and respectability are subjected, by being excluded from the right of voting, to heavy dues amounting to 2,000*l.* a year, from which those possessing that right are exempted. I am convinced that the enlargement of the franchise will enable the people of Ireland to make considerable advances in industry and trade; and I have great hopes that we shall have immediate proofs of its increasing commerce. There are many places of great commercial importance which have not at present their due share in the representation. Of these the principal are Belfast, Limerick, and Waterford, to which I propose to give representatives, so as to add three to the whole number

of members for Ireland. (Great noise.) In the arrangements which we propose, Ireland and Scotland will derive likewise considerable advantages, from the cutting off of some members from the English representation. I think it will be considered an important advantage in the sister countries, that the numbers in this House shall be better balanced. I am sure it will give great satisfaction. (Hear, hear.) It is not intended to make any other alteration in the right of voting for the Irish counties, except that benefited clergymen shall be qualified to vote as 50*l.* freeholders. At elections the votes are to be taken from the opening of the poll to the conclusion—in the same manner as in England. (Much noise, hear, hear, and order.) The result of all the measures comprehended in this Bill, as affecting the number of Members in this House, will be that of the present number of 658—168 being taken off by the disfranchisement of the Boroughs—400 will remain. To that number five being added as the increase of Members for Scotland, three for Ireland, eight for London, and 142 for the rest of England and Wales, making the future number of members of the United Parliament 596. (Hear, hear, and great noise.) The decrease of the present number will accordingly be sixty-two. I will now state the number of persons who will be entitled to the suffrage under this bill, not previously possessing that right, in the different boroughs and towns, in London, and in the counties. I suppose that in the counties the franchise will be extended to 110,000 persons; in the towns to 50,000; in London to 95,000; in Scotland to 50,000; and in Ireland to about 40,000 persons. (Hear, hear.) In the counties at least 110,000 will be entitled to vote who never before possessed the franchise (hear, hear); and it is my opinion, that the whole measure will add to the constituency of the Commons House of Parliament, about half a million of persons, and these all connected with the property of the country, having a valuable stake amongst us, and deeply interested in our institutions. They are the persons on whom we can depend in any future struggle in which this nation may be engaged, and who will maintain and support Parliament and the Throne in carrying that struggle to a successful termination. I think that those measures will produce a farther benefit to the people by the great incitement which it will occasion to industry and good conduct. For when a man finds, that by industrious exertion and by punctuality in paying all his engagements, he will entitle himself to a place in the list of voters, he will have an additional motive to improve his circumstances, and to preserve his character amongst his neighbours. I think, therefore, that in adding to the constituency, we are providing for the moral as well as for the political improvement of the country. Having now, Sir, gone through the principal provisions of the Bill which I propose to introduce, I cannot but take notice of some particulars in which, perhaps, this measure

will be considered by many to be defective. In the first place, there is no provision for the shorter duration of Parliaments. (Hear.) That subject has been considered by his Majesty's Ministers; but, upon the whole, we thought that it would be better to leave it to be brought before the house as a separate provision, than to bring it in at the end of a Bill regulating matters totally distinct from it. (Hear, hear.) Without saying, therefore, what is the opinion of his Majesty's Ministers respecting that question, which I myself think to be one of the utmost importance, and to deserve the utmost care in its decision, I shall keep the large measure of Reform, which this Bill comprehends, separate from every other question, and leave the subject of the duration of Parliaments to be brought before the House by some other Member at a future time. (Hear.) For my own part, I will only say, that whilst I think it desirable that the constituency should have a proper control over their representatives, it is, at the same time, most inexpedient to make the duration of Parliament so short, that the Members of this House should be kept in a perpetual canvass, and not be able deliberately to consider and to decide with freedom any great question. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I do not think that it behoves the people of a great empire to place their representatives in such dependence. (Hear.) What the point then is, at which we may fix the proper control of the constituency, I do not think it necessary to discuss at present. When the question comes under the consideration of this House, I shall be ready to deliver my opinion. I have now only to state, that the King's government are satisfied that, in providing a popularly elected representation, they ought to abstain from embarrassing that question with any other, which is encumbered with its own doubts, difficulties, and obstacles. (Hear.) There is another question, Sir, of which no mention is made in this Bill, although it at present occupies very much the attention of the country—I mean the question of vote by ballot. Sir, there can be no doubt that mode of election has much to recommend it. (Cries of No, no, no! hear, hear.) The arguments which I have heard advanced in its favour are as ingenious as any that I ever heard on any subject. But at the same time I am bound to say, that this House ought to pause before it gives its sanction to that measure. The hon. Member for Bridport says, that the ballot affords the only means by which the elector can be secured in the independence of his vote. But, Sir, I must say, that while on the one side it favours the conscientious voter in the exercise of his franchise, it, at the same time, affords a cover to much fraud, (hear, hear,) and exposes the voter to much bad passion. If it would prevent a bad influence over the good, it would also prevent a good influence over the bad. I doubt, likewise, whether in a country like this, accustomed to vote openly, electors would ever avail them-

selves of the secrecy of the ballot. I am bound to say, moreover, that, above all things, it appears very doubtful that it would be at all advisable to have any class of persons wholly irresponsible in the discharge of a great public duty. (Hear, hear.) But the ballot would certainly lead to such irresponsibility. I know that men of rank and wealth are in favour of that measure. I know that men of enthusiastic minds are in favour of a measure, by which they suppose all influence over the electors would be removed. But I am not satisfied that the electors should not be subject to that influence which the several classes of the community exercise over each other—which the Crown exercises over the Peers, the Lords over the Commons, and the people over their representatives. Sir, I do not wish that any man in the country should possess an irresponsible power, knowing that man's mind is liable to be clouded by every variety of error, and to be swayed by every ruling passion. (Hear, hear.) Besides, Sir, I would have great objections to anything which would appear to me to overturn the principles of our oldest institutions. But it may be said that we overturn those principles in our measures of reform; on the contrary, I hold that we act more in accordance with the principles of our ancestors in conceding, than in refusing reform. (Hear.) They said that Sarum should have representatives on the same grounds on which we now say give representatives to Manchester and to other large towns. I remember, indeed, that Mr. Burke said in one of his speeches, that the House of Commons was, at that time, constituted on the same principle as ever, because the same places continued to send representatives. But, Sir, I wonder that a man of Mr. Burke's powers of mind could argue in that manner. He might as well have said that the Roman Empire in his day was governed on the same principles as in the days of Brutus. Sir, it is not acting upon the original principles of the Constitution to continue to Sarum the franchise given to it in the reign of Edward the Third, when the town no longer exists, with the population for whom that franchise was intended. I cannot believe that any reform which we can effect will prevent wealth, learning, and wit from the possession of influence, although there is no doubt that we may occasion more trouble in the use of it. My right hon. Friend, the Attorney-General, is an illustrious instance, out of many, of the successful exercise of the influence of talent. The extension of the franchise in the boroughs will enable many bankers, lawyers, and merchants to come into this House, to contribute their learning, experience, and zeal to the counsels of the nation. We are told that reform in the representation will destroy the influence of the aristocracy. But, Sir, I say, that wherever the members of the aristocracy reside, exercising the large power which they possess for the good of those who live around them, it is not in human nature that such an aristocracy

could lose their influence in the election of Members to serve their country in Parliament. It is not proper that they should have, as they at present have in some cases, the direct nomination of the representatives of the people; they will, under any system of reform, always possess the influence which it is right that they should possess. But if by aristocracy those persons are meant who do not live among the people, who know nothing of the people, and who care nothing for them—who seek honours without merit, places without duty, and pensions without service—for such an aristocracy I have no sympathy (great cheering); and I think the sooner its influence is carried away with the corruption in which it has thriven, the better for the country, in which it has repressed so long every wholesome and invigorating influence. (Hear, hear, hear.) Language has been held on this subject, which I hope will not be heard in future. A call has been made upon the aristocracy—all who are connected with it have been summoned to make a stand against the people. Some persons have even ventured to say, that they, by their numerical strength, could put down what they call sedition. (Hear, hear, hear.) But the question at issue does not respect the putting down of sedition. The real question is, whether, without some large measure of reform, the business of the country can be carried on with the confidence and the support of the people? I shall not ask whether you can resist reform, but I say, that it has become a question whether or not the Constitution would now perish if reform be deferred? (Loud cheering and cries of hear.) This House in its unreformed state has nothing to look to but the sympathy, confidence, and support of the nation. If it now refuse reform, that sympathy will be withheld—that support will be denied. I ask you, then, whether when his Majesty's ministers are convinced that reform is necessary, and when they have the approbation of the Sovereign for bringing a proposition before the House, in bringing forward which they declare that reform is indispensable (hear)—when multitudes of petitions poured upon your table, and myriads of voices out of doors call for reform—will this House say that we are the judges of our own honesty, that we despise the advice of the Crown, and disregard at once the warning of ministers, and the demands of the people, whom we profess to represent? Will this House say, we shall keep our power, keep it how we may; we regard not the petitions, and will take the consequences of that disregard. (Hear, hear, hear, and "No, no.") The aristocracy of England have never been found wanting in any great crisis. They have not been found wanting when the country has been engaged in war with a national enemy. They have been at all times foremost, when there were burdens to be supported. I am sure, Sir, that they are now as ready as any other subjects to give their country that support. I now ask them, Sir, will they refuse

to identify themselves with the people when sacrifices are to be made? I ask them whether they will not come forward to support the security of the throne, the stability of our institutions, the strength and the peace of the country. (Hear, hear.) Whatever may be the result of this proposition, the King's Ministers feel that they have done their duty. They have hitherto proceeded in the line of duty, in a straightforward course, neither seeking the support of a particular class, nor courting the approbation of the multitude. When duty led them to oppose popular clamours, they did not hesitate. By the rigorous enforcement of the laws, the disturbances which prevailed in some districts in England have been put down. By the rigorous enforcement of laws which existed when we came into office, we have, I hope, checked the disturbances with which the sister kingdom was threatened. In neither instance can we be accused of yielding to popular outcry, or of entrenching ourselves in popular favour. The Government, I think, has a right to be believed, when it states, that it is not for any sinister measure that it has brought forward this proposition; but, because it is interested, as everybody must be, in the future welfare of the country; and I do think, that this measure will tend to promote that welfare, by placing the institution on a more secure and satisfactory basis. I think that this is the only way calculated to secure permanency to that institution, which has so long been the admiration of foreign nations (cheers) on account of its public spirit (cheers); but which cannot exist much longer (murmurs of discontent), but by means of an infusion of a new popular spirit. To do this, you must show that you are determined not to be the representatives of a small class, or of a particular interest; but to form a body, who, representing the people, springing from the people, and sympathising with the people, can fairly call on the people to support the future burdens of the country, and to struggle with the future difficulties which it may have to encounter; confident that those who called upon them were ready to join them heart and hand; and were only looking, like themselves, to the glory and welfare of England. (Loud cheering.)

Sir J. SEBRIGHT seconded the motion; but, in a few observations which he made, was nearly inaudible, owing to the number of Members who quitted their seats after the noble Lord had concluded his statement. The hon. Baronet observed, that the statement which had been made by his noble Friend was so distinct, and so clear, that he felt himself highly honoured in having that opportunity of seconding it. Reform was in his opinion a measure so necessary to give tranquillity to the country, and to uphold its real interests, that his only sorrow was that it had not been brought forward sooner. He had come down to the House without knowing what the plan of Reform was to be; but he thought that it

was more than probable that he should vote for any plan of Reform, because he saw how much it was needed. He believed Reform to be absolutely necessary; for that House, which professed to be the representative of the people of England, had entirely lost their confidence. Upon that conviction he would have voted for almost any plan; but since he had heard the plan of the noble Lord, which, as far as he had been able to follow it, appeared to be good in every particular, he would not trespass further on the time of the House, than to express how happy he was to second such a proposition. He, for one, would fully, heartily, and thoroughly give his support to this measure, which appeared to him to be the most desirable that had ever been brought forward.

The question having been put from the Chair,

SIR ROBERT INGLIS said, that no one could approach the discussion of such a subject at any time without feeling great difficulty, but now that difficulty was much enhanced, considering the circumstances under which it was brought forward. He was aware that, in opposing the principle upon which the noble Lord had gone, he should have to repeat many arguments that had been made use of before; but it should be remembered, that they were arguments which, employed in better times by more able advocates, had induced the House to refuse its assent to the proposition against which they militated. It was, however, true, as stated by the noble Lord, that the question came under somewhat new circumstances before the House. For the first time, as the noble Lord had observed, it came before them sanctioned by the Government. This was true; and now, for the first time, they had heard one, who, though not a Minister, shone with the reflected light of the Government, came down in the face of Parliament, and stigmatised that House as unworthy to pass between the people and the throne. (Cheers from the Opposition Bench on the floor, loudly re-echoed from the other parts of the House.) This was language which in other times had never been heard from any representative of the Government, in or out of office. The noble Lord had also said that this measure was supported by the demand of the people. (Cheers.) He would not say that this language was absolutely unparliamentary, but it was certainly as near to threatening as it could be to be consistent with the rules of the House. (A cry of "No, no.") The noble Lord had also said, that there would be myriads of petitions and millions of demanders: he admitted that the noble Lord had added, "for their just request," at one time; but at another he had said, "to demand their rights;" and when he was told that the people were to demand any-thing, he was reminded of an expression of Horne Tooke, "that the people had hands," and he entirely thought that it was desirable that the business of the House should be con-

ducted without any reference to the number of persons demanding, which, in his opinion, was a direct interference with their deliberative character. (Hear, hear.) Now, in the first place, he begged to deny the fact, that the people did demand reform. (Murmurs of "oh, oh.") He denied it, because, at former periods, the same argument had been used, when they were called on to reform themselves, because the people demanded it.

LORD JOHN RUSSEL made some explanation relative to his use of the word "demand," the purport of which did not reach the Gallery.

SIR ROBERT INGLIS continued: If the noble Lord intended that the demand of the people was not to end in intimidation, he would submit to the correction; but, as he understood the phrase, and as it was probably understood by the majority of those who heard it, (hear, hear), it seemed to imply, that if the House did not grant it, the people would take the remedy in their own hands. (Hear, and a cry of no, no.) At very many periods in the history of this country (he was going to state, when he was interrupted), many applications had been made for reform, though, probably, they were not so vehement or so numerous as at present (hear, hear); but, at all events, they were so numerous as to justify the exclamations then which they now heard, with the distinction, that they now came before the House backed with the authority of the Ministry. He would not fatigue the House with any reference to very remote times; but there was a passage in Burke which might (changing only the date) apply almost exactly to the present period. The passage was from a work of his, entitled, "Thoughts on the Cause of the present Discontents;" and it appeared so extraordinarily applicable to the present state of things, that when he should read it to the House, he thought they would venture to say, that the present apprehensions might be out-lived just as easily as those which were painted so strongly in Mr. Burke's observations. The passage ran thus, "There is something particularly alarming in the present conjuncture. There is hardly a man, in or out of power, who holds any other language; that hardly anything, above or below, abroad or at home, is sound and entire; but that disconnection and confusion in offices, in parties, in families, in Parliament, in the nation, prevail beyond the disorders of any former time. These are facts universally admitted and lamented. This state of things is the more extraordinary, because the great parties which formerly divided and agitated the kingdom, are known to be in a manner entirely dissolved. No great external calamity has visited the nation—no pestilence or famine. We do not labour at present under any scheme of taxation, new or oppressive in the quantity or in the mode. Nor are we engaged in unsuccessful wars, in which our misfortunes might easily pervert our judgment." This was the statement which Mr. Burke had thought fit to make; but all this we had out-lived. By relying on the vigour and firmness

ber of
union,
libera-
in the
at the
"oh,
er pe-
used,
them-
nation
," the
lery.
noble
people
d sub-
stood
erstood
(hear,
House
the re-
a cry of
history
when
us had
y, they
as at
s, they
excla-
with the
ore the
the Mi-
ise with
ut there
chang-
y to the
a work
ause of
ared so
ut state
it to the
e to say,
be out-
painted
The pas-
sicularly
There
ho holds
anything,
s sound
and con-
silies, in
round the
are facts
his state
because
ded and
be in a
external
estilence
nt under
essive in
e we en-
our mis-
gment,"
urke had
had out-
firmness

of the Government, all these things had been removed, and by being removed, the constitution of the country had been preserved entire. From the statement of another author, it would appear, that in the year 1782, the people demanded reform so earnestly, that it was in vain to think of resisting it; that, in fact, there was hardly an hour to spare; he was quoting Horne Tooke, when he said, "That the people must be satisfied in their just expectations, and that the Ministers would grant what they were no longer able to deny; he would venture to assert that they would not much longer refuse." He (Sir Robert Inglis) was ready to admit that there was an expectation now existing among the people, but not to the extent stated by the noble Lord. The present excitement had arisen from the example of France and Belgium. (Hear, hear.) It was all to be found in the three days of Paris, and the events which had followed those three days. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) When there was any excitement of insurrection in other countries, it had been found to be an epidemic disease, and, as such, brought to this country also, whether through the air, or specifically by direct contact, he did not know; but this at least was certain, that simultaneous popular tumults were produced. (Hear, hear.) The same remarkable effect was produced in 1793, and in Condorcet there was a passage which particularly referred to Parliamentary Reform in this country. Condorcet observed, that "since the explosion of liberty in France, a hollow fermentation had shown itself in England, and had more than once disconcerted the Ministry; popular societies had been formed in the three kingdoms, and the necessity of Parliamentary Reform was as much talked of as that of calling together the States-General had been in France in the year 1787. It was well known that numbers had come over to enlighten the people of England, who at once feared and wished for such alteration as would irresistibly draw them along. The opening of the coming Parliament would be the occasion of such a Reform as was most urgently required, and from thence the formation of a Republic would be less tedious, because the seeds of liberty had long been planted in England." The consequence of the Reform that was proposed—let it be called by what name it would—would be that the whole of the power would be placed in the hands of the people. Even if he were disposed to admit the facts of the noble Lord, he should deny his inference. They were sent there by the people, not to legislate day by day according to their will, but to act on their deliberate judgments, for the best interests of the country and of the state. (Hear, hear.) There was a great distinction between this case and the case in which the greatest number of petitions ever known had been presented to that House—he meant the Roman Catholic question. In that instance, as he had stated at the time, the people prayed for the conservation of what

they already possessed: in this instance what they were asking for was a change; and he never would admit that a man could have so good a judgment about what he had not, as about what he actually had. (Hear, hear.) It was, therefore, no inconsistency in him to have called on the House then to support the prayer of the people, and now (even if he believed that it was the desire of the people) to refuse their demand. He was sure that a mere multiplication of the numbers entitled to vote for representatives could be of no advantage to the country; for without quoting a very trite remark, he might observe, that it was quite as possible for, great tyranny to be in the hands of many as of one. He contended, therefore, that to increase the number of voters throughout the country by a million, would not add either to the freedom or the value of the deliberations of that House. They were not sent there for the particular spot that they represented; for if they would look at the King's Writ sent to each returning officer, they would see that the number for the largest county, as well as for the smallest borough, was required to attend to consider the affairs of the country and the good of the Church. This was the qualification which the King required of them, and this had no reference to the particular place which they represented. At one time such an argument might have been just, when it was necessary that the Member for any borough should belong to that very borough which he represented; but since the passing of the Act by which non-resident members were accepted as eligible, there was nothing so specifically to unite them to the local interests of the place which they represented. When a Member was returned to that House, he ceased to be responsible to his constituency. It was at the end of the period which he had to serve in Parliament that he again came before them, and it was then only that he was accountable to them. The noble Lord, like many other theorists, seemed ready to worship the work of his own hands; like them, also, he seemed to have formed a theory of the Constitution which was not to be found in any part of the practice of that Constitution. (Hear, hear.) In the United States, in France, or in Belgium, where there were changes from day to day, such a proposition as that of the noble Lord might meet with favour; but in England, where they had the precedents of a long succession of ages to which to refer, the case was very different. The king's writs and other documents had existed from time immemorial: and these were the only means from which they could derive information with respect to the constituent duty. He knew that there were such men as Delolme and Montesquieu, who took on themselves to talk of representation being founded on the basis of population or taxation: but he could find no trace of such a principle in any of the ancient times of our Constitution. He could not find that at any period of our

history population had been made the basis of representation. The noble Lord had said, that he had grounded his plan on the principle of our ancestors, and as they had called upon Old Sarum and Gatton to return Members, so he would call on Manchester and Leeds. He (Sir R. Inglis), however, must doubt exceedingly; whether at any period of our history population had ever entered into the calculation on which boroughs had been called upon to send representatives to Parliament. At the same time he knew that it had been held by no less an authority than Mr. Hallam, that if they looked at the map of England and saw a place that was not represented now, it was certain that it was a place of no importance when the system of the representation of the country had been formed. He thought, however, that if they examined into the subject, they would find that this was not the case. What was it that had first induced the Sovereigns of this country to call a Parliament together? It was because they wanted men and money to carry on their wars; and their appeal had been made to the *liberi homines*. The next thing that took place was the calling on the "communities" to assist at these Parliaments; but in this case each community had but one vote, so that even if two Members were returned they had but one vote between them. At that time the county of Cornwall had but eight Members. He presumed, that if it could be shown that places were called on to return Members which were neither parishes nor market towns, it would be admitted that those places could not be very considerable. Now there were Haslemere, West Looe, and others, which had never been one or the other, and yet they had been called on to send representatives to Parliament. After this he did not see how it could be contended that population or taxation was the basis on which the principle of representation had been grounded, for not only small towns had been called on to send representatives, but large towns had been left unrepresented; and this was a most important point, in answer to those who pretended they only asked for the restoration of the constitution. He well remembered the statement in that House of an honourable and learned Gentleman (now Lord Brougham) who had said that his object was not revolution, but restoration: that noble Lord had said that he was an enemy to visionary and untried experiments—to rash and untried theories. He (Sir R. Inglis) called on that noble and learned Lord's colleagues to defend the present measures against the charge which he brought against it, of being a rash and untried speculation, utterly destructive of every thing that had hitherto existed. He called on the noble Lord to show any trace of what he had that night laid down in the former precedents of England. Let him show that any town or borough had been called into Parliamentary existence because it was large and populous, or excluded from it because it was small. The noble Lord

had tried to make much of the instance of Old Sarum; and this had always been the great stumbling-block with those who had pursued the same line of argument. In one and the same year, the 23d of Edward I., a writ had been issued to both Old and New Sarum, and in neither case had it been conferred on account of population or taxation. On the contrary, he believed that it had been given in the first instance to oblige some Earl of Salisbury, by putting his friends in the House. And in an account of the borough it was stated that it had lately been purchased by Mr. Pitt, the possessor of the celebrated diamond of that name, who had thus obtained an hereditary seat in the House of Commons, as much as the Earl of Arundel possessed one in the House of Peers by being the owner of Arundel Castle. How, then, was it to be said that, according to the constitution of the country, Noblemen were not to be represented and their interests regarded in that House? The cause of the creation of many boroughs was, he believed, obscure; but, on the other hand, some were as clear and as well ascertained as possible. It was known that two writs to return members had been issued by Elizabeth, at the desire of one of her favourites, Sir Christopher Hatton; and Newport, in the Isle of Wight, had received its franchise to please Sir G. Carew. This was the history of many of the small boroughs; and, in fact, all the Cornish boroughs had exclusively been formed in that manner. Fifteen Cornish boroughs had at one time received the right of representation, some of which were only small villages, and none of them entitled to rank as considerable among the towns of England. It was in vain, after this, to talk of the purity of representation in former times. He defied the noble Lord to point out any period when the representation was better than it was at present. He therefore said, that what was proposed was not restorative. The House and the country might judge what it was; but he would state in one word, that it was "Revolution." (Loud cheers.) A reform like that of the noble Lord was nothing but revolution (cheering); a revolution that would overturn all the natural influence of property, and of rank. (Hear, hear.) Another objection to this great evil was, that it would derange all that system by which the constitution of this country had become the glory of England, and the admiration of the world. Under the circumstances which now existed, there had been at times brought together (under the influence of the crown and of the aristocracy) a body of men who had displayed more honesty, more virtue, more public spirit, more talents, and more zeal for the service of their country, than had ever made their appearance within any other walls, or in any other country. (Hear, hear.) He had already alluded to the opinion of Mr. Hallam, and he ought at that time to have observed, that many of the towns to which the noble Lord proposed to give the elective franchise were

ce of
n the
had
n one
l, a
New
con-
ation.
been
e Earl
n the
ugh it
chased
ed di-
and an
ns, as
one in
mer of
be said
of the
resented
House?
roughs
e other
ascert-
at two
ued by
her fa-
New-
ved its
is was
roughs;
had ex-
Fifteen
ceived
of which
of them
ough the
ter this,
former
oint out
as better
re said,
torative.
ge what
rd, that
A re-
nothing
ion that
ence of
Another
it would
constitu-
glory of
rld. Un-
ted, there
er (under
the aris-
displayed
lic spirit,
service of
their ap-
r in any
d already
n, and he
ved, that
ble Lord
chise were

considerable places at the period when the right of representation was given to other places, and yet they were omitted. Halifax, three hundred years ago, was known to have a population of 8400; Wakefield was a most considerable town at the same time; and Manchester, according to tradition, had not less than 5400 inhabitants for two hundred years before the year 1580; and, at all events, it was certain, that at that latter period, it possessed the amount of population he had just mentioned. But, in answer to this, was it to be said that no boroughs had been created after that time, and that therefore it had not been possible to do justice to such considerable places? Just the reverse of this was the fact; for after the date to which he had referred with respect to Halifax, fifty-one boroughs had been summoned to send representatives to Parliament; and after the date with respect to Manchester, fourteen boroughs had in like manner received writs. He did not intend to enter into the question of whether it would be advantageous to large towns to receive the elective franchise, though he must confess that he did not know how much Manchester had lost by not having every five or six years such election scenes as that which had lately taken place at Liverpool; but, at least, the advantage thus to be derived was very questionable. Which of the two, Manchester or Liverpool, was the most prosperous he did not know; but both, at all events, enjoyed a high degree of prosperity; the one was prosperous with two representatives, the other without any; and he had never heard that any of the commercial interests of the latter had suffered from the want of having advocates in that House, who were able and willing to maintain its rights. (Hear, hear.) He had another objection to that part of the proposition of the noble Lord, in which he would have taxation and representation go hand in hand; and which put him in mind of the title of a pamphlet he had seen, and which was called, "Taxation Tyranny without Representation." His objection was, that he did not see how this principle could be adopted; for, in the event of a contested election, those who voted in the minority would have no representation at all. Without making any personal allusion, he might recall to the memory of the noble Lord, that there were individuals who came into that House only upon a casting vote. In such cases the minority was all but equal to the majority, and yet they were to have no representation. If the principle of the noble Lord was worth any thing, it was worth this—that no person of such minority would be bound to pay the taxes, or obey the laws that were enacted, as his representative had no share in their formation. Such a principle was wholly untenable; and he contended, that such an assertion, made by such an authority in that House, was calculated to do infinite mischief, as tending against good order, and to make the people disobedient. The great benefit of

the condition of the House of Commons, as it now existed (though, if the noble Lord's plan was adopted, that benefit would cease), was, that it admitted all classes, represented all interests, and admitted all talents. If the proposed change took place, the members would be almost entirely confined to one interest, and no talent be admitted but the single one of mob oratory. The effect would be to confine the representation to those members who were called popular; and that alone would be sufficient to destroy all the present advantages that the House afforded to the country. Many of those who sat for close and rotten boroughs, as they had been that night designated, for the first time, by a member of the Government (cheers); many of those who had constituted the chief ornaments of the House, and had been in former times the support of the country, would, if this plan had been adopted in their days, never have been received into that House. He would ask the noble Lord by what other means the great Lord Chatham had come into Parliament? By the bye, the first borough for which that great man had sat was Old Sarum itself. Mr. Pitt had sat for Appleby. Mr. Fox had come in for a close borough, and when rejected by a populous place, he again took refuge in a close borough. Mr. Burke had first sat for Wendover; and when, by that means, he became known, he was transposed in his glory to Bristol, as Mr. Canning, who also first sat for Wendover, was transposed to Liverpool. When their talents once became known, they were the honoured representatives of large towns; but would such places ever have thought of selecting Mr. Canning, Mr. Burke, or Lord Chatham, if they had not previously had an opportunity of showing their talents in the House? (Cheers.) It was only by this means that young men, who were unconnected by birth or residence with large towns, could ever hope to enter that House, unless, indeed, they were cursed—he called it cursed—with that talent of mob oratory, which was used for the purpose of inflaming the lowest and most debasing passions of the people. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Burke had stated, that it was essential that all interests should be represented. The noble Lord, indeed, had stated, that lawyers, bankers, and merchants would somehow get in: he had not, however, taken the trouble to explain how it was to be done. But this he (Sir R. Inglis) would say, that as law, commerce, and finance, were subjects much discussed in that House, it was highly necessary that there should be persons connected with those matters from whom the House might derive information. But, at all events, the other interests of the country seemed to be entirely passed over. How were those who spoke of the interests of the distant colonies of England to obtain seats? Let it not be said, that in arguing thus he was arguing in favour of a system of corruption. He never would admit that it was corrupt. If any one could satisfy

him that it was a corrupt system, he would be one of the first to say, that if it involved any breach of faith or duty, the practical advantages could not be such as to justify its continuance. But what he meant to contend was, that under this system our Constitution was formed; and under this alone could it be maintained. With the exception of the Hon. Member for Waterford, the hon. Member for Kilkeuny, the hon. Member for Cornwall (as we understood the hon. Baronet), and the hon. Member for Staffordshire, there were very few Members who took an active part in the proceedings of that House, who had not entered it as Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Burke had done; and he therefore contended, that unless such opportunity was still afforded, it would tend to deteriorate the talent and ability possessed by the House. Unless he was told something more than could be collected from the vague declamation he had heard that night, he should continue to believe, that at the present moment that House was more independent of the Crown and of the Aristocracy than at any former period. He could easily show that the House was not, in one respect, what it had been formerly, but that made more against the argument of the noble Lord than for it. He could show how much more dependent it was at all times upon the Crown and upon the Aristocracy than at present. Would it be said that the dependence of that House, and the influence and authority exercised over it, was greater at that time than in the reign of James II.? Would the House, in its present state, bear to be treated as it had been treated in the reign of Henry VIII.? Tracing the history of Parliament and the country down to the latest years—there was no period of our history when the influence of the Crown was so slight as at the present moment. What was the state of things in the time her Queen's Majesty directed the Sheriffs to return to Parliament such men only as were of a particular faith in matters of religion, and of known compliance in matters of politics? And, in the reign of Edward VI., the Sheriffs were directed to select only such Members as had been previously recommended by the Privy Council. If they were to refer to the olden time for specimens of the independence of that House, it would not be to the period of the reign of Henry IV., nor to the time of Richard II., when a Member of Parliament was threatened to be executed, for merely making a Motion on the Civil List. Such summary vengeance was, indeed, rare in modern times.—(Here the noise which prevailed generally throughout the speech of the honourable Baronet, rose to such a height, that he was for some moments inaudible. When heard, he was repeating his former assertion, that at no time had the House of Commons been so independent of the crown and of the aristocracy as at the present day.) Time was, when the Duchess of Norfolk determined not only who should sit for the county of Norfolk, but who should

represent Maldon in Parliament; when Lord Essex could return his kinsman for the county of Stafford, and his servant for the borough of Tamworth. In neither case was there that freedom from influence and that perfect representation which the reformers always assumed to belong to past times. The honourable Baronet then proceeded to dwell upon the facility (as we understood him) with which the repeal of taxes had of late years been conceded to senseless clamour. He hoped that no feelings of timidity would so far influence the votes of that house as to put the just rights of the crown to hazard, or endanger the principles of that constitution under which the country had so long flourished, and from the loss of which it would inevitably decay! Unless the House was prepared to restore that negative of the crown, which, though disused since the Revolution, had never been totally destroyed—unless they were prepared to restore that negative, they could never presume to go any length in altering the state of the representation. He begged of them to recollect what had been the amount of the secret service money antecedently to the period of the Revolution; and it was well known that secret service money had always been used for the purpose of procuring majorities in that House, to promote the views of the crown and the Administration for the time being. The amount of the secret service money at the time to which he referred was 90,000*l.* a year, being one twentieth of the whole income of the country at the period in question. At the present day the secret service money did not amount to one seven hundredth part of the income of the nation, and no man now believed that anything like direct pecuniary bribery was practised upon the members of that House, or had been for the last forty or fifty years. He believed that no man in the country believed but that any inducement in the nature of pecuniary bribe to any member to give his vote in a particular manner upon any question would be rejected with disdain. (Hear, hear.) He was assured that no direct pecuniary bribe was usually offered in these times; and he entertained no doubt, that if such bribes were offered they would be utterly unavailing to induce members of that House to give their votes one way or the other. He knew that in the time of Mr. Pitt loans were given—that is, shares in loans were given to such members of that House as were in the habit of supporting his Majesty's Government. Those loans were made in secret, and the shares were distributed amongst the Government Members; but since that time he was persuaded that nothing in the nature of pecuniary bribery was to be heard of in connection with the members of that House. Even the corruption by places had in a great degree ceased to exist; and from the diminution of placemen within the walls of that House, the House had lost much of the legitimate influence which it ought to possess, but it was all the while gaining power of another description, and in a different man-

ner; and whatever power the Crown was losing the House gained. The time had now arrived when members were heard to say, he hoped they would never be enabled to say so upon good grounds, that it was now idle to talk of the ambassadors being the servants of the crown. He really was in no slight degree surprised when it was said that the ambassadors to foreign states were not to be considered as the servants of the crown. Was not the crown an essential and inherent part of the constitution? And if it possessed the power of making peace or war, of maintaining amicable or hostile relations with other Powers, surely, then, the ambassadors it sent forth were to be considered its servants. If ambassadors ceased to be considered the servants of the crown, the army and navy, by the same rule, might be called the servants of the state, and that would lead at once to nothing short of republicanism. In further proof of there being not only no necessity for reform, but of its being unjust and inexpedient, he would observe, that at no period of the history of this country had there been so little party spirit in the business of the legislature as at the present day; and that he confessed he looked upon as one of the misfortunes of the times that there was no party in the present day; the misfortune of the time was, that there were no two great leading men to divide in nearly equal portions the House and the country, and to take the lead of each division, under whose banners public men might range themselves; but though that was not the case, and though it was to be regretted that it should be so, yet it was at least available for one purpose; that of affording an argument against reform, as showing the independence of individual members of Parliament. It was almost ludicrous to notice so often, the frequent references to old times, seeing that they made so much against the interest of the reformers in the time of Elizabeth; so far from the House possessing a greater degree of influence than at present, that Queen told them in direct terms that they were not to interfere with matters concerning her prerogative royal. She expressed her admiration, not in the eulogistic sense of the word, that they should have presumed to interfere with the exercise of her prerogative; and such was their servility and subservience at that period, that they went seriously about taking into consideration whether or not they would ask permission to treat about such small matters as sheep, and wool, and malt; but it was the opinion of the House that they were too weak to treat of such matters as peace and war. Every day the people were becoming more and more intelligent, and further and greater was the sympathy between the people and their representatives. One great source of the increasing influence of the people was the increased amount of petitions presented to that House. The noble Lord himself could not deny that the petitions to that House had of late years prodigiously increased. In the year 1701, when the famous

Kentish petition was presented, it was looked upon as quite a prodigy. Then the increased influence of the Press afforded another argument against reform; it was an influence by which they were all more or less bound, all orders in the state were bound by the influence which the Press exercised. By means of circulating libraries and book clubs, all classes of the people had become readers; and when they had come to read all that passed in that House, and all that was said out of doors of public men, being members of that House or not, the intelligence and the comments of the Press were conveyed almost with the speed of lightning to every quarter of the earth where the English language was spoken or understood. The effect of all these measures and proceedings being openly canvassed was, that it had made the House of Commons alive to all that the people felt upon any matter that might form a subject of political discussion; that, then, had worked a real reform, and all the reform that was necessary, for it established that sympathy which should subsist between the people represented and the people by whom they were represented. By the system of petition which now so generally prevailed, the wants and wishes of the people on all subjects were made known to the legislature. It was true, that by a convenient fiction, the proceedings of that House were as a sealed book to the people of the empire; but by another convenient fiction, that seal was removed every morning, and the people made acquainted from one end of the United Kingdom to the other, with every thing that had been said and done in that House the preceding evening. In the times so triumphantly referred to by the reformers, the people knew nothing of the proceedings of that House, for it was then a gross breach of privilege to make any publication concerning them. The debates were then given, as they might be seen in the old volumes of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, reported as they were in the days of Dr. Johnson, as the proceedings of a political club, the names of the members being concealed under the appellations of Hortensius, Cato, Petronius, Flaccus, and such like. He had now to call the attention of the House to a matter of considerable moment. He believed that in the history of civilized man there was not to be found any system of representation so completely popular as that of the noble Lord's, co-existing with a free Press on the one hand, and a monarchy on the other. He believed that there was no instance upon record of a free Press being placed in juxtaposition with a monarchy and a system of representation such as that proposed by the noble Lord. Before ten years passed away, they might rest assured that the measure of the noble Lord, if agreed to, would produce a shock so decisive, that all the institutions of the country would give way before it, he said, if carried, but for himself he had no apprehension that it ever would. There was small danger that such a measure as that

could ever receive the sanction of the House. An attempt at such an experiment as that had been made by the National Assembly in France. Something of the sort had been attempted in Switzerland also, and a similar trial was now being made in France. How it might terminate it was not for him to anticipate; but he sincerely hoped, and, indeed, had little fear, that any such experiment would ever be tried in this country. In France it was perfectly well known, for it was too obvious to escape observation, that the attempt to produce a purely popular representation had interrupted the country in the fairest course of liberty, arts, domestic trade, and foreign commerce, to which that particular country had ever attained; and he entertained not the slightest doubt, that were the calamity proposed by the noble Lord to be inflicted on this land, that a similar result would ensue. (Cheers.) When the noble Lord, from whom and from whose Government the present measure proceeded, forty years ago made a proposition in that House for a much more moderate reform, he did not conceal from the House that that very moderate reform involved a fundamental change in the Government of the country. What was he not then bound to admit with respect to a reform plan, that went, at a blow, to sweep away one-third of the House of Commons? Were it agreed to, the House of Lords, before ten years, would have but a nominal existence. He would call upon some right honourable gentlemen opposite, supporters of the late Mr. Canning; he would call upon them to answer the eloquence and reasoning of their renowned leader, now no more. He said, that if the representation of the people was complete and perfect in all its parts, nothing could withstand its power and authority. In his (Sir R. I.'s) opinion, an unreformed House of Lords would not for a moment be tolerated by a reformed House of Commons; and Mr. Canning more than once expressed his full conviction that the House of Lords could not continue as at present constituted if the measure of reform were once carried with reference to the House of Commons. Would a reformed House of Commons endure the interference of a House of Lords—would they permit them to interfere with the Civil List—would there not be an appeal to physical force? Much had been said out of doors respecting the duration of Parliaments. There was very little foundation for the complaint on that subject, for during the last 300 years, it actually turned out, upon examination, that only twenty-one parliaments sat above three years, and that the average duration of all the parliaments of that period was only two years and eight months. The Ballot, too, was open to this objection, that in every instance it required a previous scrutiny. Finally, it was his persuasion, that under our present happy form of Government, we enjoyed more of public peace and commercial prosperity than any other country.

MY TRIUMPH.

TO
THE READERS OF THE REGISTER,
ON

The Destruction of the Boroughmongers.

Bolt-Court, March 3, 1831.

MY FRIENDS,

You, I mean, who have been observers of my labours, and who have stood faithfully by me for the last twenty years; you, who heard the chuckling of the base and bloody boroughmongers when I was shut up in prison in 1810; you, who heard the ferocious ruffians chuckle aloud, when, in order to retain the power of finally destroying them, I escaped to Long Island, in 1817; you, who have witnessed the manner in which I have fought them inch by inch, in which I have sustained the unequal combat single-handed from the year 1808, up to *Saturday last*, you will sympathise with me in the joy, in the inexpressible delight, which I now feel at their total overthrow, at the destruction of them by the hands of those very men who they hoped would have preserved them. *Forgiveness!* Yes, we are to forgive when atonement is made to us; and upon that principle I shall act, to be sure.

My friends, in that gloomy moment when I was taking my departure from England, in 1817, in order to save myself from the dungeons of Castlereagh and Sidmouth, in which the victims were deprived of the use of pen, ink, and paper; in that gloomy moment, when, expressing to you, at the same time, my determination not to give up the combat, but to fight the ruffian boroughmongers with my long arm, I then addressed you, and, in that address, I made use of the following words: "My countrymen, be you assured that there will be no change for the better in England, until there shall come an *open war between the land and the funds*. The question is, then, can the boroughmongering system outlive this war? If it can; if the army can still be kept up, and the personal safety of all the people can still be suspended at pleasure by

"the Parliament; if this *breach between the two systems* DO NOT LET IN REFORM, it is hard to say how very low this country may be sunk in the scale of nations. Let us hope, however, that this is not to be the fate of our country: let us hope that she is yet to be freed from this millstone of debt, and this all-degrading boroughmongers' curse."—*Leave-taking address, Register, vol. 32, pages 19 and 23.*

Have I not, then, a right to be proud? Is not this day the day of my triumph? Yes, and of your triumph, too. How many thousands of you have been actually ruined merely because you had the honesty to avow that you held my opinions! How many hundreds of thousands injured in some degree; annoyed, vexed, goaded through the sides of their families; teased, tormented and worried: but, how many thousands actually ruined, actually reduced to beggary, for holding, and for having the honesty to avow that they held, those opinions which are now become the opinions of the nation at large, and which are now about to receive the stamp of an act of Parliament! Nay, my friends, I have to relate to you, and I shudder with horror as I write, that the prisoners in jail on account of the late riots have been carefully canvassed for the purpose of ascertaining *whether they read my writings!* Nay, I have to relate to you that two of the worthiest men that England ever produced have just been transported for life from Hampshire, not for fires, not for breaking machinery even, but for forming part of an assemblage who got a trifling sum of money from a farmer. The proprietors of all the land in the parish in which they lived, came and gave them the best of characters. It was proved by the parson of the parish, and of the adjoining parish, that they were two most sober and industrious men; and that, so far from resorting to any-thing but their labour for support, *they of themselves supported their widow mother.* In short, the whole world cannot produce two labouring men of more exemplary character and conduct. But

it appears, from an article in the bloodiest of bloody publications, the *Times* newspaper, that those two brothers had long been "*readers of Cobbett's Register.*" I will take an opportunity shortly of publishing the infamous paragraph from that infamous paper, which chuckled with delight that those two men were to be transported for life, leaving their widowed mother to starve or go to the parish for relief. Of these two excellent men, JOSEPH and ROBERT MASON, of the parish of Bullington, in Hampshire, I never heard any-thing in my whole life until the trials at Winchester took place. Bullington is close by the estates of the BARINGS. Every-thing was sifted out relative to what was called "the politics" of these men; and it was found that they regularly took the Register, and that one of them read it aloud every Sunday night, or some one night in the week, to twenty or thirty of the villagers. I will hereafter publish as full an account as I can of all the proceedings against these two men; and be you assured, my friends, that as long as I have my senses remaining, I will never cease to endeavour to obtain them justice, if justice be not obtained for them before those senses cease. I rest, observe, upon the statement of the execrably bloody newspaper above-mentioned. When I have time to inquire into all the facts, you shall be more fully informed upon the subject. I enjoy this day of triumph; but I cannot, during even this day, forget JOSEPH and ROBERT MASON; and, indeed, if I knew their names, I might, I dare say, add hundreds to the list of victims whose cases it would have been and may become my duty elaborately to mention.

Now, then, as to the reform proposed by the Ministers, I have not the means of giving the detail accurately as yet: the reports are necessarily imperfect; but this we know, that the infamous rotten boroughs are to be *wiped off.* If the Ministers had stopped there, I should have applauded even that: I should have said they had done well. But they have done a great deal more than this: they have extended the suf-

frage, though not to all householders, yet to householders of a very low degree: they have taken in copyholders and leaseholders without disfranchising freeholders; they have given representatives to a great number of populous places which had them not before; and, in short, it is a reform which we *all* ought to approve of, which we all ought to applaud. It does not extend so far as *my wishes* would go; but, as I have always said, in the first place, every sensible man takes what he can get; and, in the next place, we are to consider that here was a great variety of interests to be combated, and a great mass of prejudices and aristocratical fears to subdue; and the question with the ministers was, in the first place, whether they should make no reform at all, and thereby expose the whole fabric of the government to destruction, and the country to convulsive revolution; or whether they should make, all at once, such a reform as would satisfy all reasonable men for the present, and not expose the fabric to total destruction, by a breaking up of every vestige of the former species of representation. For my own part, I am of opinion; an opinion settled in my mind after the most impartial investigation and mature consideration, that there would have been no danger to the prerogatives of the King, to the just privileges of the Peers, or to any of the institutions of the country properly so called, if, at once, the right of voting had been extended to every man being of twenty-one years of age, of sane mind, and untarnished by indelible crime; and if the voting had been settled to be by ballot. I am firmly convinced that the aristocracy, that the crown, and even that the clergy would have found themselves better under a reform to this extent than they will do now. But, it does not follow that I am not to applaud, and greatly to applaud, that which has now been done. On the contrary, so much has been done now, that I am quite willing to wait, and patiently wait, too, for its fair effects; and, if those effects be such as to render further change unnecessary

for the good, for the happiness, of the people, and for the revival of the greatness of the country, I should be quite content with what has been done; and, I am sure that the country will be content. With how much less should we have been content in 1817! And now let the base and brutal and insolent boroughmongers reflect on their exultation when the Parliament, in answer to our humble and earnest prayers, for far less than has now been conceded; let them reflect on their exultation, on their inexpressible baseness, in chuckling at the passing of a law by which we were consigned to dungeons, at the pleasure of SIDMOUTH, CASTLE-REACH, SCOTT ELDON and Co.! If the name of OGDEN should come athwart their minds, will not the ruffians now tremble in their shoes! Forgive! Oh, yes, I am for forgiving, the moment atonement shall be made. I want no atonement made *to me*. But, when I forget other sufferers, may God forget me! What! do I not recollect when the "*authorities*" of Manchester were prepared with horse, foot, and artillery, to prevent me from going to that town to dine with friends who had invited me to dine there? Do I not recollect when JOHN HAYES, of Bolton, was crammed ten weeks into a stinking prison because he went round with a bell to apprise the public-spirited people of that town that their countryman, William Cobbett, had arrived at Liverpool, in good health? Not for me do I demand redress. I call for no atonement towards me; but as long as this tongue or pen shall be able to move will I seek to cause atonement to be made for those who have suffered unjustly for my sake.

However, sufficient unto the day is the triumph thereof. I cordially approve of what the ministers have done; and, for the first time, in about eight and twenty years, I am quite anxious to give a Ministry my support, though some base tax-eaters are, at the same moment, prosecuting me, and that, too, in the meanest and most malignant manner. A prosecution, however, which I will cause to cover them with confusion

the
eat-
quite
and,
con-
we
now
bo-
tion
our
less
them
their
king
which
s, at
TLE-
! If
come
the
shoes!
iving,
made.
But,
GOD
collect
hester
and
ing to
who
Do I
ES, of
s into
round
pirited
untry-
ved at
for me
for no
as long
able to
ment to
suffered
e day is
ally ap-
e done;
at eight
xious to
gh some
moment,
in the
manner.
h I will
onfusion

and disgrace. It is curious enough, that, in the *Register* published only the week before last, speaking of the stupid plots and contrivances intended to drive me out of the country, I said, "Abscond, indeed, here is an impudent fellow, talk of my absconding!" "a pretty set indeed, in the House of Commons and the Hells to make me abscond. They may now pass suspension-of-*Habeas-corpus*-acts, dungeon-acts, gagging-acts; they may put down the press altogether: they may do what they like; but never shall they make me abscond or quit English ground. They are much more likely to abscond than I am. I have done my work; I have firmly planted the tree; and, please God, I will remain to see and taste the fruit. In the first of these two last, I was wrong. I had not quite done my work: I finished that last Saturday, in the ever-living article called 'FRENCH REPUBLIC and ENGLISH REFORM.' That was the finisher of my work; and it will take a great deal to persuade any man who has read it, that it had not a considerable share in urging the Ministers to adopt that grand measure, which now fills the mouths of all honest men with applause. The work, however, is now done. Here is the tree, bearing the fruit; and, respecting you, fellows, BLANDFORD and SLAPP, here am I to taste the fruit, in spite of your backbitings and slanders.

Though, however, I ascribe a great part of this grand work to my own Herculean labours, the nation at large has its share; and I am by no means for denying that great merit belongs to the Ministers for what they have done. Their enemies in Parliament are nothing, they themselves having the people at their back; but they have had other greater enemies to overcome, and much greater enemies, too; the greatest of all the enemies that men in power know any-thing of; namely, *their own pride* and deep-rooted prejudices. Here the combat must have been severe indeed! They have had the courage to set at defiance those taunts which their political opponents were sure to deal in, with regard to

their want of firmness to resist what they call the "clamours of the people." They have the good sense, the real courage, to set these taunts at defiance. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. The voice of the people is the voice of God;" and when it is the voice of a *whole* people, it is the voice of their Creator. Therefore, to act upon a fear of opposing the voice of the people was, in the language of Scripture, the "beginning of wisdom." And you have only to look back to the fate of CHARLES the First, to the fate of LOUIS the Sixteenth, and the aristocracy and clergy of France; to the fate of George the Third, with regard to the American States, to be convinced that the Ministers have now acted *wisely* as well as justly. They are entitled, therefore, to our hearty commendations for their conduct, not, however, like servile creatures overlooking the great share in the triumph which is ascribable to ourselves.

With regard to the opposition to this measure, it is sheer nonsense. Had it been a little trifling measure, the opposition would have thrown out the Ministers, and the nation, regarding the two factions as forming but one body, would have taken the Reform into its own hands. This paper that I am now writing will go to the press before I shall know the result of this day (Thursday's) debate; but, in all probability, the second reading of the bill will not take place until early next week, when the division on it (if any division) will, of course, take place. The bill will pass; and though I *know* nothing about the matter, I should suppose that the present Parliament will sit the Sessions out, transact the necessary business of the Session; then be prorogued, then dissolved, and the new and Reformed Parliament elected in the month of October, rendering immortal the memory of the year 1831. The interest excited by the deliberations of the remainder of this session will be far less than the interest excited in the nation at large by the proceedings in a vestry of any of the parishes of Westminster or of London. The nation, full of hope, will be quiet in

every part of it. We shall hear of no more riots and disturbances; no more petitions for a repeal of the Union with Ireland; and I am firmly of opinion with Mr. HODGES, that, unless in cases where deep revenge has been left imprinted on the heart by deeds of injustice and of cruelty too great for human nature to endure, we shall hear of no more fires. Mr. HODGES, though the villanous "reporters" have given us no part of his speech, told the Ministers, in the House of Commons, on Saturday last, that "he had the inexpressible pleasure to tell them that the riots and fires had wholly ceased in the county of Kent, for which he was a member; that he verily believed that cessation to have arisen from the hope and expectation which the people entertained of an extensive and efficient Reform of the Parliament; and that he believed most firmly, and most solemnly declared that belief, that, *if such reform were refused, the riots and the fires would begin again.* I believe so too; and it was upon precisely this principle that I proceeded in those lectures in Kent and Sussex which the bloody *Times* newspaper, in conjunction with the certificates of Parson RUSH and of WALTER BURRELL and Co. endeavoured to represent as the cause of the fires in those counties. At every place (and I can call witnesses from every place to prove it) I advised the farmers to call all the people of their several parishes together; to bring with them a short petition ready written for Parliamentary Reform; to sign it, and to get the people to sign it too; to assure them that that would bring them better times if their prayer were attended to; to tell them that their prayer would be attended to, and that, therefore, they ought to be patient in the meanwhile. This, I told the farmers, would fill the people with hope, would make them patient, would *put a stop to the fires*, and to violences of all sorts. And it is for having laboured thus, that this infamous and bloody newspaper has been labouring day by day to prepare the way for causing my blood to be shed! However, here is Mr. HODGES

foretelling, in Parliament, too, that he believes that the fires will recommence if the Parliament be not efficiently reformed. I have triumphed over this bloody newspaper; but I repeat, what I have said a hundred times over, that no Parliamentary reform ever can be worth a single straw, which will not give rise to a state of things that will bring punishment on the heads of such ruffians as those who have laboured through the columns of this newspaper, to cause the destruction of the liberties and the lives of the people. There is no act of cruelty, not of *oppression* am I speaking, but no act of cruelty, of savage barbarity, that this bloody newspaper has not defended and even called for. Like the croak of the raven, its voice has been the omen and precursor of death; and it has seemed to be mortified that there was nothing beyond death to glut its propensity for blood. Amongst the advantages of this measure of the Ministers is to be numbered the exposure of this bloody newspaper. It has now turned about suddenly, and is as loud in cries for the destruction of victims of another sort. Its furious and brutal assault of this morning (Thursday) upon Lord ELLENBOROUGH is a sort of first step in its general assault upon every pensioner and sinecurist; and if such were unhappily the case, that a DANTON, a COLLOT D'HERBOIS, and a ROBESPIERRE, were to *succeed* the present King and his Ministers, we should see this bloody newspaper, not their apologist, but the Coryphæus of the band of writers, breathing blood and carnage. I beseech my readers in particular, and all the public, now to keep their eye upon this vehicle of sentiments of blood. It hates the present Ministers: it attacked them the other day in the most brutal manner, when it thought the duration of their power was uncertain. It said, of this Ministry, that all was "feeble-ness, uncertainty, CROTCHET, and POULETT THOMSON." This was only last week; and the viperous attack arose from the *proposition to lower the tax upon newspapers*, which it knew to have originated with Mr. Thomson.

During the summer, the Ministers will have plenty of time to arrange what is called the machinery of taking the elections. They will have the people all in good humour; and, severely as they feel the taxes, and odious as are the tithes, they will find every one willing to pay. The Ministers may throw aside all the stupid projects which have been intruded upon them for getting rid of the people. They will soon find that they have not got too many people. They will soon find, too, that that deep disgrace to the country, the flocking of people of property to America, will cease. I could give them some most striking proofs of this; but I have not room in the present *Register*.

Let not the ministers be disheartened at the *fall of the funds*, even if they should come down to 40 or 30. Let them remember the words of the first Lord CHATHAM: "The stocks are a good criterion enough: for, when they *fall* you may be sure that the nation is *rising*: and when they rise, you may be sure that the nation is *falling*." But, without going so far back as the time when this great statesman delivered this sentiment, have we, the reformers; have I, and has Lord GREY, forgotten the year 1817, when, in answer to a speech of Lord HOLLAND, in which he most urgently pleaded (but in vain) that the persons whom the ministers might choose to imprison should be permitted to see their kindred and friends, and to have the use of pen, ink, and paper; and when he described the disgrace that the dungeon-bill would bring upon the country, and the alarm which it would excite in the breasts of the people; when he did this, for which he was applauded by every good man in the kingdom, the dry and short answer of unfeeling Liverpool was, "Let the noble Lord look at the funds! He will there see that public credit has been benefited by the introduction of this Bill, for the funds have risen ever since the determination of Parliament was known." Therefore, let the ministers not be alarmed at the fall of the funds. Let them recollect 1817; and

they will congratulate themselves that the muckworm has taken an alarm at their measures. It is *the nation*: it is this industrious, this laborious, this honest people, that hail their measure with joy and thanks; and what need they care for the feelings or opinions of a mercenary band who are sucking the blood of this people, and who are undermining all property, and all the institutions of ages? There is, however, a very able article in *The Star* newspaper of yesterday, showing that the measure must ultimately be advantageous even to the fundholders themselves. And I say so, too, provided they be content with that which is *equitable*; for there is no question that a refusal of efficient reform would, in a few years, and more probably in a few months, have deprived them for ever of every farthing that they claim. Every sensible fundholder that I have ever known, who is unable to remove his money from the funds, has expressed his willingness and readiness to submit to a very considerable reduction in positive amount. It would be easy to show that a reduction must follow in other things, and that the fundholder would in reality lose but very little by a reduction in his interest. But there will be time enough to discuss these things hereafter.

At present, before I conclude (my room being small), let us turn and take a look at the dejected countenances of the fellows who are to be trundled out of the rotten boroughs: let us look at the DIVANS, called close corporations; let us look at the hypocritical, profligate, profoundly lying, beastly, mercenary crew called free burgesses and freemen; let us look at the swarms of attorneys of inexpressible villany; villany, as BURKE calls it, *defecated*; that is to say, purged of every alloy arising from the remains of conscience. Let us look at all these; see the heterogeneous group; and see them all destroyed "at one fell swoop," by the hand of little Lord JOHN, who, in future story will surpass the famous "Little John," the brother or the rival champion of ROBIN HOOD, and even "JACK the GIANT-KILLER," himself. Sir

CHARLES WETHERELL may crack his jokes upon the little paymaster, as he called him, as long as he pleases; but the country will be very much disposed to entertain some degree of gratitude towards the instrument of the destruction of such a monstrous evil. The anger of Mr. HORACE TWISS was much more natural than it seemed natural to the public that *this* ministry should have left him any thing to be angry for the loss of. When this hero came into parliament, he made his *debut* in a furious attack on the Parliamentary Reformers. I told him at the time, "Ah! HORACE, HORACE, you are of the *true breed*, and are upon the *right scent*, but you come into the pack too late: the game will soon be all gone; and, when that is the case, God Almighty only knows what is to become of you!"

Amongst the consequences of this grand measure will be the complete exposure of all the sharn patriots; of all the *dirty souls*, who, by professing that they wish for reform, thought to escape the vengeance of the people, if a convulsive Revolution should take place. These vile hypocrites, and some of them the basest of Boroughmongers too, always took special good care to exercise their corrupt power in such a way as to perpetuate, if possible, that corrupt power, which will now be blown up, and that too by their own apparent consent and good-will! The touchstone of these will be, when the separate question of the *Ballot* comes to be discussed. By every means in their power, except open means, they will oppose it. The Ministers will do well to propose it, and to maintain it to their utmost, to prevent the possibility of having insincerity ascribed to them. It will give them strength, too, against the implacable enmity of the borough-monger crew. But it will do this, which is more than all the rest: it will *leave nothing to be demanded*; and that is the great thing of all. It will silence the boroughmongers; silence every enemy that the Ministry has upon the face of the earth. When, in 1815, the base COURIER, and the BLOODY TIMES

exulted in the everlasting fall of the Reformers, and, in answer to their petitions, referred them to the History of the Battle of Waterloo; and, when the former of these papers exclaimed, in the height of its intoxication of savage joy: "The play is over: we may now go to supper;" I answered, "No, we cannot go to supper yet; we must first pay the reckoning for the play, and in order to pay that reckoning, we must first have Parliamentary Reform." We have got that now, and therefore, we may prepare for *the supper*; and, it seems that we are to have it in grand style; for, the bloody *Times*, which called for the putting us into dungeons, in 1817, for having petitioned for Reform, now calls upon the cities of London and Westminster for a grand illumination to celebrate the passing of the bill. If this illumination should, as I hope it will, take place, all that I shall want, all that I shall lament the want of, will be the power of calling up the saucy CANNING and the venerable Major CARTWRIGHT to witness that illumination. The next thing to the having them in their proper persons, is that of having them in effigy: that of CANNING in a Dustman's cart drawn by an old rip horse, representing a fallen boroughmonger, the effigy clad in mourning, with the words, "*a low, degraded crew*" (the appellation which he gave the reformers in 1809) coming out of his lips; and the venerable MAJOR in a triumphal car, decked with laurel, the effigy itself furnished with a civic crown. At any rate, one of the very first acts of a reformed Parliament ought to be, the causing of a monument, in the most honourable of all the spots that can be found, to be erected to the memory of this wise and brave man, who spent fifty years of his life in endeavour to obtain that which has, at last, been accomplished.

WM. COBBETT.

THE INDICTMENT.

THE following words which are put in italics is what is called the libel of which some mean wretch or other has

accused me. The whole paragraph is taken from the Register of the eleventh of December, and that is the one that TREVOR barked about in the House of Commons, according to the report of the bloody *Times*. The part selected for prosecution is the part marked by italics, leaving out the head and tail of the paragraph. The reader will see what a base and contemptible proceeding this is. I am not sure, by any means, that it is the Government which has made this attempt. I shall, however, get it out at last, and I should not be very much surprised if I were to trace it back to the very first instigator, or propagator of the affair of GOODMAN. In another Register, I will publish the result of my inquiries. Only think of the bloody *Times* putting forth a paragraph to cause it to be believed that it was a publication similar to that for which Mr. Carlile has been so severely punished; and then some other of the base London newspapers, sending it all over the country that I was actually in Newgate already. However, TREVOR's seat will be taken from under him by about this day week; for Romney is amongst the boroughs to be scratched out. This reform brings all due revenges, and gives us protection for the future. The execrable monopoly of the press, and all its unpunished and infamous slanders, will be swept away amongst other crying evils. If I were proprietor of a newspaper, the proprietorship of which was worth 20,000*l.* last Saturday, I should now be glad to sell it for five.

In the meanwhile, however, the parsons are reducing their tithes with a tolerable degree of alacrity! It seems to come from them like drops of blood from the heart; but it comes; and it must all come now; or England will never again know even the appearance of peace. "Out of evil comes good." We are not, indeed, upon that mere maxim, to do evil that good may come from it." But without entering at present into the motives of the working people, it is unquestionable that their acts have produced good, and great good too. They have been always told, and they are told now, and by the very parson that have quoted above, that their acts of violence, and particularly the burnings, can do them no good, but add to their wants by destroying the food that they would have to eat. Alas! they know better; they know that one thrashing-machine takes wages from ten men; and they

also know that they should have none of this food; and that potatoes and salt do not burn! Therefore this argument is not worth a straw. Besides, they see and feel that the good comes, and comes instantly too. They see that they do get some bread, in consequence of the destruction of part of the corn; and while they see this, you attempt in vain to persuade them, that that which they have done is wrong. And as to one effect, that of making the parsons reduce their tithes, it is hailed as a good by ninety-nine-hundredths even of men of considerable property; while there is not a single man in the country who does not clearly trace the reduction to the acts of the labourers, and especially to the fires, for it is the terror of these, and not the bodily force, that has prevailed. To attempt to persuade either farmers or labourers, that the tithes do not do them any harm, is to combat plain common sense. They must know, and they do know, that whatever is received by the parson is just so much taken from them, except that part which he may lay out for productive labour in the parish: and that is a mere trifle compared with what he gives to the East and West Indies, to the wine-countries, to the footmen, and to other unproductive labourers. In short, the tithe-owners take away from the agricultural parishes a tenth part of the gross produce, which, in this present state of abuse of the institution, they apply to purposes not only not beneficial, but generally mischievous to the people of those parishes.

COMMON HALL.

There is to be a COMMON HALL on Monday, to take into consideration the propriety of passing resolutions, pledging the City to support the Ministers in carrying into effect the Reform that they have brought forward. At that Hall, please God, I will be. I should be ashamed to be a Liveryman of London and to be absent on this occasion. I do hope, that there will be a general illumination, as the Bill has been carried in the Commons. Let the HELLS, in St. James's Street, be in darkness and in mourning; but let the tax-paying people rejoice.

From the LONDON GAZETTE,

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1831.

INSOLVENTS.

FEB. 25.—CHEESEMAN, J., Reading, baker.

—HAMMAR, C., Gower-place, Euston-square, merchant.

—JOYCE, R., Cambridge, boot and shoe-maker.

FEB. 23.—SMITH, G. and R. Foulerton, Gutter-lane, Cheapside, warehousemen.

BANKRUPTS.

BADDELEY, J. C., Brixham, Devonshire, ship-owner.

BOCHSA, N. C., Regent-st., dealer in music.

CARTER, H., Portsea, surgeon.

CHADWICK, B. Ashton-under-Line, victualler.
 GEDDES, J., George-town, Demerara, and
 Gracechurch-street, merchant.
 PALMER, G., Epping, schoolmaster.
 PARIS, J., Ray-st., Clerkenwell horse-dealer.
 PEEDLE, G., Little Missenden, Bucking-
 hamshire, cattle-dealer.
 POPE, C., St. Philip and Jacob, Gloucester-
 shire, copper-manufacturer.
 WILMOT, W. G., Chapel-street, Grosvenor-
 place, builder.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1831.

INSOLVENT.

FEB. 26. — JONES, L. C., Abergavenny,
 linen-draper.

BANKRUPTS.

ASKIN, E., Lichfield, printer.
 BARNARD, R., Hollingbourn, Kent, paper-
 maker.
 BRITTEN, D., Breda, Holland, packer.
 CROW, J., Bedford-st., Covent-garden, tailor.
 DEWES, R., Knaresborough, merchant.
 DRING, J., Oxford, mercer.
 FOWLER, T., East Butterwick, Lincolnshire,
 potato-merchant.
 FRY, J., Liverpool, merchant.
 GRIMSHAW, J., Rawden, Yorkshire, mercht.
 HEEL, T., Gateshead Low Fell, Durham,
 draper.
 LEWIS, T., King's-road, Chelsea, builder.
 PHILLIPS, H. N., Edward-st. Regent's-park,
 tavern-keeper.
 RIGMAIDEN, H., Liverpool, wine-merchant.
 WRIGHT, T., Manchester and Salford, to-
 bacconist.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, FEB. 28. —

We have a short supply of Wheat this morn-
 ing, and the quotation for this Grain may be
 given the same as on last Monday. We have
 a largish supply of Barley, and the fine mait-
 ing qualities may be quoted at an improve-
 ment of 1s. per quarter from the price of this
 day week, but in other sorts there is no varia-
 tion. We have a very large supply of English
 Oats, and this Grain may be given at 1s. per
 quarter cheaper than on this day week. In
 Rye, Beans, Peas, and other articles of Grain,
 we can quote no variation.

Wheat	76s. to 82s.
Rye	30s. to 34s.
Barley	40s. to 42s.
— fine	46s. to 49s.
Peas, White	42s. to 44s.
— Boilers	45s. to 49s.
— Grey	36s. to 42s.
Beans, Small	42s. to 45s.
— Tick	36s. to 40s.
Oats, Potatõe	27s. to 33s.
— Poland	25s. to 27s.
— Feed	21s. to 21s.
Flour, per sack	60s. to 65s.

PROVISIONS.

Bacon, Middles, new, 44s. to 46s. per cwt.
 — Sides, new... 43s. to 45s.
 Pork, India, new, 110s. 0d.

Pork, Mess, new... 55s. to 57s. 6d. per barl.
 Butter, Belfast 96s. to 98s. per cwt.
 — Carlow 94s. to 100s.
 — Cork 96s. to 98s.
 — Limerick... 96s. to 98s.
 — Waterford... 92s. to —s.
 — Dublin 90s. to —s.
 Cheese, Cheshire 40s. to 70s.
 — Gloucester, Double.. 48s. to 56s.
 — Gloucester, Single.. 44s. to 50s.
 — Edam 40s. to 46s.
 — Gouda 42s. to 46s.
 Hams, Irish..... 45s. to 56s.

SMITHFIELD—Feb. 28.

Beef, for prime young Scots, fetches from
 4s. 6d. to 4s. 10d. per stone, and in the Mutton
 trade, prime young Downs are as high as 5s.
 to 5s. 6d. per stone. In Veal, the price of the
 finest young Calves is 6s. to 6s. 4d. per stone,
 and dairy-fed Porkers sell at 5s. to 5s. 6d. per
 stone. Beasts, 2,407; Sheep, 14,860; Calves,
 110; Pigs, 140.

THE FUNDS.

	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.
3 per Cent. } 78½ 77½ 77½ 76½ 76½ 76½						
Cous. Ann. }						

CHEAP CLOTHING! !

SWAIN AND CO., Tailors and Drapers,
 No. 93, Fleet-street; beg to inform the
 public that, as they manufacture the whole of
 their Woollen goods, they make
 A Saxony Cloth Coat for 2 12 6
 Ditto, Kerseymere Trowsers 1 5 6
 Ditto, ditto, Waistcoat ... 0 12 0

Being, for a whole Suit, only 4 10 0

Petersham Beaver Great Coats 2 15 0
 Talma Cloaks of Superfine Cloth ... 3 0 0
 A Suit of Livery..... 4 0 0

And every other article in the trade propor-
 tionably cheap!

Observe that their shop is 93, Fleet-street.

I recommend Messrs. Swain and Co.
 as very good and punctual tradesmen,
 whom I have long employed with great
 satisfaction. WM. COBBETT.

REFORM.—The OBSERVER of Sunday,
 Price Sevenpence, will contain the Ex-
 pose of Lord Russell to the extent of five of
 the Observer folio columns. It may suffice to
 state that this Report of Lord Russell's speech
 is abridged from Wednesday's Morning Chroni-
 cle. A Monday Edition of the Observer, price
 Sevenpence, peculiarly adapted for Country and
 Foreign Circulation, is regularly published at
 Four o'Clock every Monday Afternoon at 169
 Strand.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and
 published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.